



# ***JPRS Report***

## **Arms Control**

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

19981120218

REPRODUCED BY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

# Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-91-018

## CONTENTS

26 July 1991

### CHINA

Bush Asks Senate To Ratify CFE Treaty <i>[XINHUA 12 Jul]</i> .....	1
Sino-Soviet Border Force Reduction Talks Fourth Round Ends <i>[XINHUA 9 Jul]</i> .....	1
Reports on Paris Perm-5 Mideast Arms Control Talks .....	1
Vice Foreign Minister Addresses Talks <i>[XINHUA 8 Jul]</i> .....	1
Soviet Approach Outlined <i>[XINHUA 9 Jul]</i> .....	2
Conference Ends <i>[XINHUA 10 Jul]</i> .....	2
Further on Liu Huachi Remarks <i>[RENMIN RIBAO 10 Jul]</i> .....	3
'Reservations' on Communiqué <i>[XINHUA 10 Jul]</i> .....	4
Development of Strategic Missile Force Viewed <i>[Beijing TV 3 Jul]</i> .....	4
World Disarmament Trends Analyzed <i>[Hu Yumin; SHIJIYE ZHISHI No 12, 16 Jun]</i> .....	5

### EAST ASIA

#### NORTH KOREA

Pullout of Nuclear Weapons From South Urged <i>[KCNA 17 Jul]</i> .....	7
U.S. Paper Cited on U.S. Troops, Weapons Withdrawal <i>[KCNA 15 Jul]</i> .....	7
Solidarity Group Statement on U.S. Nuclear Arms <i>[KCNA 9 Jul]</i> .....	7
Withdrawal of Nuclear Weapons in Asia Urged <i>[KCNA 9 Jul]</i> .....	8
Solidarity Chairman Demands Nuclear-Free Zone <i>[KCNA 7 Jul]</i> .....	8
Peace Committee Statement on Nuclear Issue <i>[KCNA 6 Jul]</i> .....	9
Soviet Official, Other Figures Cited on Nuclear Issue <i>[KCNA 6 Jul]</i> .....	9
Japanese Paper Cited on for Nuclear Weapons <i>[KCNA 6 Jul]</i> .....	9
Head of Lawyers Group Views U.S. Nuclear Stand <i>[KCNA 5 Jul]</i> .....	10
Denunciations of U.S. Nuclear Threat Cited <i>[KCNA 5 Jul]</i> .....	10

#### NEW ZEALAND

Minister 'Angry' at Latest French Nuclear Test <i>[AFP 16 Jul]</i> .....	10
Scientists Record French Nuclear Test <i>[AFP 15 Jul]</i> .....	11
Second French Award Causes 'Another Upset' <i>[AFP 14 Jul]</i> .....	11

### EAST EUROPE

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Deputy Defense Minister on Stationing of Soviet Nuclear Arms <i>[K. Pezl; CESKE A MORAVSKOSLEZSKE ZEMEDELSKE NOVINY 4 Jul]</i> .....	13
---	----

#### HUNGARY

General Annus on Soviet Troop Withdrawal <i>[MAGYAR NEMZET 3 Jul]</i> .....	13
---	----

#### POLAND

Spokesman Denies Soviet Troop Withdrawal Date Fixed <i>[PAP 12 Jul]</i> .....	15
---	----

### NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

#### PALESTINIAN AFFAIRS

PLO's Abu-Sharif Urges Halt to Mideast Arms Race <i>[MENA 9 Jul]</i> .....	17
--	----

## IRAN

U.S. Mideast Arms Control Proposal Criticized <i>[Tehran Radio 10 Jul]</i> .....	17
Chinese Premier Cited on Mideast Arms Control <i>[Tehran Television 8 Jul]</i> .....	18

## ISRAEL

Foreign Minister on Mideast Arms Sales Control Conference <i>[AL HAMISHMAR 8 Jul]</i> .....	18
---	----

## SAUDI ARABIA

Support of Ban on Mass Destruction Weapons Noted <i>[Riyadh TV 16 Jul]</i> .....	18
--	----

## SOVIET UNION

### GENERAL

Ponomarev Assails U.S., NATO Arms Policies	
<i>[B. Ponomarev; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Jul]</i> .....	20
Reports on Paris Perm-5 Meting on Arms Sales Controls	22
Churkin Comments <i>[TASS 8 Jul]</i> .....	22
Commentator Views Issue <i>[Yu. Solton; Moscow International 8 Jul]</i> .....	22
PRAVDA Report <i>[11 Jul]</i> .....	23
Soviet Delegation Chief Comments <i>[TASS 10 Jul]</i> .....	23
Meeting Called 'Unprecedented' <i>[Yu. Tyssovskiy; TASS 11 Jul]</i> .....	24
USSR Said To Influence Outcome <i>[INTERFAX 12 Jul]</i> .....	25
'Important Landmark' <i>[V. Ovchinnikov; PRAVDA 12 Jul]</i> .....	25

### START TALKS

Reports, Commentary on Washington Talks	26
Moiseyev Comments on Outlook <i>[TASS 10 Jul]</i> .....	26
Bessmertnykh Arrival Statement in Washington <i>[TASS 10 Jul]</i> .....	26
White House Talks Start <i>[TASS 11 Jul]</i> .....	26
Bessmertnykh 'Very Satisfied' With Outcome <i>[TASS 14 Jul]</i> .....	27
Compromise Reported <i>[TASS 15 Jul]</i> .....	27
Compromises on Technical Issues <i>[A. Blinov, V. Nadein; IZVESTIYA 16 Jul]</i> .....	27
TASS Correspondents Review Talks <i>[15 Jul]</i> .....	29
'Good Chance' for Jul Treaty Completion <i>[Yu. Solton; Moscow International 15 Jul]</i> .....	30
Bessmertnykh, Moiseyev Comment <i>[B. Kalyagin; Moscow TV 15 Jul]</i> .....	30
Depart Washington 15 July <i>[TASS 15 Jul]</i> .....	31
Bessmertnykh, Moiseyev on Arrival in Moscow <i>[G. Smelev; TASS 15 Jul]</i> .....	31
Bessmertnykh, Moiseyev Interviewed <i>[Moscow Radio 15 Jul]</i> .....	32
Churkin on Attempts To Complete START Talks .....	32
Views Upcoming Washington Talks <i>[INTERFAX 9 Jul]</i> .....	32
Comments at Press Briefing <i>[IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]</i> .....	33
Bush Reportedly Set 'Deadline' for START Completion <i>[V. Nadein; IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]</i> .....	34
Military Official on Technical Issues in Washington Talks	
<i>[V. Nosenko; Moscow International 11 Jul]</i> .....	34
Navy Group Preparing for START Inspections <i>[V. Makarov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Jul]</i> .....	35
U.S. Figures Call for 95-Percent Strategic Arms Cuts	
<i>[G. Gerasimov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 29 Jun]</i> .....	36

### SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

Discussion of GPALS Variant of SDI <i>[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA No 64, 1 Jun]</i> .....	37
--	----

### INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

U.S. Team Inspects Kazakhstan Munitions Factory <i>[TASS 15 Jul]</i> .....	38
12 Nuclear-Tipped Scud Missiles Removed From Germany <i>[Berlin ADN 13 Jul]</i> .....	38

## CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Grinevskiy: Situation at CSBM Talks 'Rather Serious' [TASS 15 Jul]	38
U.S. Senate Takes Up Ratification of CFE Treaty	38
Bush Urges Ratification [A. Blinov; IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]	38
PRAVDA on Bush Message [15 Jul]	39
Further on Troop Withdrawals From Poland	40
Engineers Battalion Leaves Szczecin [Moscow TV 1 Jul]	40
Pontoon Battalion Leaving Torun [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jul]	40
Talks Held 9-10 Jul [TASS 10 Jul]	40
U.S. Requests CSBM Inspection in Kiev Area	40
Inspection Team Arrives [TASS 6 Jul]	40
Team Satisfied With Inspection [TASS 9 Jul]	40
Command Slows Pace of Withdrawal From Germany	
[V. Katayev; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jul]	40
Delegation Outlines Position on CFE Personnel Reductions [TASS 4 Jul]	41

## NUCLEAR TESTING

Locals To Decide on Semipalatinsk Tests [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Jul]	41
Anti-Nuclear Movement Establishes New Fund [TASS 8 Jul]	41
Further on Controversy Over Nuclear Testing in Kazakhstan	42
Two More Tests Planned for Semipalatinsk [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Jul]	42
Antinuclear Leader Comments [INTERFAX 13 Jul]	42
Kazakh Supreme Soviet Debates Nuclear Testing	
[A. Irtenyev; NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA No 77, 2 Jul]	42
Further on Economic Value of Novaya Zemlya [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jun]	43

## CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. Article on CW Shipments From Germany Rebuted [G. Krivosheyev; IZVESTIYA 13 Jul]	43
Claim of Soviet CW in Former GDR Said 'Gross Insinuation' [TASS 10 Jul]	44
CW Destruction Program Not Endorsed by Supreme Soviet [Moscow Radio 10 Jul]	45

## ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES

Envoy Views Border Forces Reduction Talks With PRC [G. Kireyev; IZVESTIYA 13 Jul]	45
Envoy Deems Border Talks 'Definite Success' [G. Kireyev; INTERFAX 12 Jul]	46
Further on Border Forces Reduction Talks With PRC	46
Fourth Round Held 13 Jun-8 Jul [TASS 9 Jul]	46
'Key Provisions' Discussed [TASS 9 Jul]	46
Commentator Hails Results [Moscow Radio 10 Jul]	47
Third Stage of Troop Withdrawal From Mongolia Begins [Moscow Radio 8 Jul]	47

## WEST EUROPE

### REGIONAL AFFAIRS

G-7 Statement on Monitoring of Arms Sales [London PRESS ASSOCIATION 16 Jul]	48
---	----

### FRANCE

'Sixth and Last' Mururoa Nuclear Test for 1991 [Paris Radio 15 Jul]	48
Official Sets Conditions for Ending Nuclear Tests [AFP 12 Jul]	48
Perm-5 Discuss Arms Sales Restrictions [Paris Radio 8 Jul]	49

**GERMANY**

Reports of Soviet CW Still Being Removed Denied .....	49
Defense Ministry Denial <i>[DPA 9 Jul]</i> .....	49
Soviet WGF Denial <i>[DPA 10 Jul]</i> .....	49
Ministers Discuss Withdrawal of French Troops From Germany <i>[DPA 9 Jul]</i> .....	49

**TURKEY**

Greek Premier's Disarmament Proposal To Be Studied <i>[Ankara Radio 17 Jul]</i> .....	50
---	----

**Bush Asks Senate To Ratify CFE Treaty**

*OW1007033291 Beijing XINHUA in English  
0143 GMT 120 Jul 91*

[Text] Washington, July 9 (XINHUA)—U.S. President George Bush today formally asked the Senate to ratify the conventional forces in Europe (CFE) treaty which requires deep arms reduction in the region.

The treaty was signed by 22 nations in Paris last November, but the United States later charged that the Soviet Union circumvented the ceilings on their armaments by transferring some equipment of the army to coastal defense units.

The two sides finally settled their differences on the treaty when U.S. Secretary of State James A. Baker III met Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh in Portugal on June 1.

The treaty calls for elimination of tens of thousands of tanks, armored combat vehicles and artillery pieces in Europe, with sharper cuts in Soviet armaments because of their numerous advantages.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the treaty is expected to get swift approval from the Senate as indicated in a letter to Bush from senior members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The members, including Chairman Claiborne Pell, Joseph R. Biden Jr., both Democrats, and Republican Senator Jesse Helms, said in the letter that they planned to conclude their committee hearings and mark up a resolution of approval this month.

**Sino-Soviet Border Force Reduction Talks Fourth Round Ends**

*OW0907021791 Beijing XINHUA in English  
0145 GMT 9 Jul 91*

[Text] Beijing, July 9 (XINHUA)—The Chinese and Soviet diplomatic and military experts held their fourth round of talks here between June 14 and July 9 for the implementation of the agreement between the Chinese and Soviet Governments on mutual reduction of military forces on border areas and the guidance of enhancing trust in the military field.

According to the Foreign Ministry, the talks were held in a friendly, earnest and practical atmosphere. Both sides exchanged views on mapping out related documents for the concrete implementation of the agreement, and agreed to hold the next round of talks in Moscow.

During the talks, Chinese Assistant Foreign Minister Jiang Enzhu and Deputy Chief of General Staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army General Xu Xin met the Soviet delegation respectively. The Soviet experts also paid a visit to Shenyang and Changchun.

**Reports on Paris Perm-5 Mideast Arms Control Talks**

*OW0807223491 Beijing XINHUA in English  
2218 GMT 8 Jul 91*

[Text] Paris, July 8 (XINHUA)—Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Liu Huaqiu stated here today arms control in the Middle East should be conducted in an equal, reasonable, comprehensive and balanced way.

Liu, chairman of the Chinese delegation at the conference on arms control in the Middle East by the five permanent U.N. Security Council members [Perm-5], stressed that countries selling large quantities of weapons to the region ought to take special obligations and responsibilities.

Liu outlined the views and propositions of the Chinese Government on arms control in the Middle East in his statement at a closed meeting opened today and is scheduled to close tomorrow.

He said arms control in the region is inseparable from a just and comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East question with the Palestine issue at its heart, emphasizing that "only when the threat of crisis and war is removed will it be possible for the region's countries to beat the swords into ploughshares."

Therefore, said the official, it is necessary to endeavour to bring about the return of the occupied Arab territories and restoration of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people in compliance with the relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions while the sovereignty and security of Israel should also be respected and guaranteed.

Liu said an international conference on the Middle East under the auspices and with the participation of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and all the parties concerned should be convened at an appropriate time.

A major part of the weapons sales to the region have come from the developed countries, said the vice minister, citing figures that over 70 percent of arms imports by the Middle East countries between 1985 and 1988 came from the major developed countries, of which the lion's share was taken by just one or two big powers whose annual weapon sales to that region exceed 10 billion U.S. dollars.

Though China has sold some weapons to the region, their quantity and quality are very limited, said Liu, adding that China has all along adopted a responsible and prudent attitude in this regard.

China maintains that the first and foremost thing to do now is for those countries that export large quantities of sophisticated weapons to that region to take a responsible approach and exercise self-restraint in real earnest

rather than calling for arms control in the Middle East on the one hand while taking the lead in dumping advanced weapons there on the other, the official said.

Liu said the principle of fair, reasonable, comprehensive and balanced arms control should be adhered to in the Middle East.

He explained that all types of weapons and all countries should be subject to control and the existing equilibrium in the region should be maintained or that the original imbalances should not be further aggravated.

China always stands for complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons as well as for prevention of the proliferation of such weapons of mass destruction, he said.

To safeguard the world peace and security, China is studying and considering the question of accession to NPT [Nonproliferation Treaty] with a positive attitude, Liu said, adding that his country is also in favour of the earliest possible conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons.

China is of the opinion that the military forces of each country should be used only for its self-defense, and no other country should try to attain an armament level beyond reasonable defense needs, said the Chinese official.

He said the legitimate right to self-defense of the Middle East countries, especially those whose territories are still under illegal occupation and whose security is being threatened, should not be compromised and that the right of each country to peaceful uses of nuclear energy and space technology as well as to scientific and technological development should not be deprived of or impeded.

Arms control in the Middle East cannot be separated from that in other regions and indeed from global arms control and it should enhance the regions' security and also the security of other regions and the whole world, said Liu.

He went on to say that disarmament and stability in a global context as well as in other regions will also serve to realise disarmament and stability in the Middle East.

The final settlement of the issue of arms control in the Middle East requires the participation of all the Middle East countries, he said, pointing out that monopolizing the whole affair by a few countries or imposing their will on the others must be prevented.

The vice minister said in conclusion that his government would like to listen to and study the proposals of other delegations, is ready to actively cooperate with them in a common effort to achieve a fair, reasonable, comprehensive and balanced solution to the question of disarmament and arms control in the Middle East.

### Soviet Approach Outlined

*OW0907022391 Beijing XINHUA in English  
0141 GMT 9 Jul 91*

[Text] Moscow, July 8 (XINHUA)—The Soviet Union intends to take an active part at the first meeting of the five United Nations Security Council permanent member-countries on restrictions of arms sales and their non-proliferation.

The Soviet approach to the meeting, which was opened in Paris today, was spelled out by Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin at a briefing here today.

He stressed the importance of joint efforts by the participants to the meeting in finding solutions to the issue.

The joint efforts, according to Churkin, included ensuring the balance of interests, observing the principle of security for the sides, consolidating global security and stability and eradicating the sources of regional tensions.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the expectation that "the meeting will be constructive in nature and it will enable the world community to lay a sound basis for further steps towards restricting arms sales, as well as to gain a better understanding of approaches to non-proliferation," Churkin said.

### Conference Ends

*OW1007073891 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service  
in Chinese 0505 GMT 10 Jul 91*

[By reporter Wang Yunji (3769 6663 0036)]

[Text] Paris, 9 July (XINHUA)—The conference on arms control in the Middle East, attended by representatives of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, closed in Paris this evening. The conference adopted, in principle, a document concerning arms control, the transfer of military goods, and nonproliferation of arms in the Middle East.

The document points out that the attendees are concerned with the current trend of arms proliferation, and they maintained that just, rational, comprehensive, and balanced measures for preventing arms proliferation and controlling arms should be adopted on a global as well as regional basis. The five nations maintain that arms exports should be conducted responsibly, and that all countries have legitimate self-defense rights and have the right to conduct legitimate arms transfers for self-defense purposes.

The document points out that the five nations support the plans to establish a zone without weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East and to carry out comprehensive arms control in the region.

The document concludes that the five nations have expressed their readiness to continue consultations on international arms trade and nonproliferation of arms.

Before the conference closed, Liu Huaqiu, head of the Chinese delegation and vice minister of foreign affairs, made a speech about their reservations. He said: "We have reservations about certain sections of the documents. We must point out, in particular, that some passages in the document about measures concerning arms control and disarmament in the Middle East are not balanced. They only ask the Middle East countries to do this or to do that, but they fail to fully consider that region's security, balance, and stability. In addition, they do not involve countries outside of that region, as well as the special responsibilities of big countries, who have the largest arsenals and export the largest quantities of weapons. We also must point out that the documents should state what should be done to maintain and enhance that region's security, balance, and stability."

#### Further on Liu Huaqiu Remarks

CM1107143791 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese  
10 Jul 91 p 7

[By reporter Wang Yunjiu (3769 6663 0036)]

[Text] Paris, 8 July (RENMIN RIBAO)—Liu Huaqiu, head of the Chinese delegation and vice minister of foreign affairs, addressed a conference on arms control in the Middle East held by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, which opened today in Paris. He stressed that arms control in the Middle East should follow the principle of fairness, reasonableness, comprehensiveness, and balance. He also pointed out that countries selling the largest quantities of weapons to the region should assume special responsibilities and obligations.

Liu Huaqiu said: The Middle East is one of the regions in the world where arms are highly concentrated. A major part of the arms have come from the developed countries. Statistics show that more than 70 percent of the weapons imported by Middle East countries between 1985 and 1988 came from major developed countries, of which the lion's share was taken by just one or two big powers whose annual weapon sales to that region exceed \$10 billion. In view of this, it is necessary, first and foremost, for those countries exporting large quantities of high-technology, sophisticated, and advanced weapons to that region to take a responsible approach and exercise self-restraint in real earnest rather than calling for arms control in the Middle East on the one hand while taking the lead in dumping large quantities of advanced weapons there on the other.

Liu Huaqiu said: Although China has sold some weapons to the Middle East region, it has all along adopted a responsible and prudent attitude toward the international arms trade and complied with the following principles: 1) The sales should be helpful to the justified defense capability of the countries concerned; 2) the sales should not be harmful to peace, security, and stability in the region; and 3) no arms trade should be used to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

If all countries concerned stop selling weapons to the Middle East region, China will have no difficulty doing likewise.

Liu Huaqiu said: By saying that arms control in the Middle East should follow the principle of fairness, reasonableness, comprehensiveness, and balance, China means that all types of weapons and all countries should be subject to control. No such thing should be done as controlling certain types of weapons only, but not those with an equivalent or even greater offensive capability. All countries in the Middle East region should be treated equally, and the double-standard practice should be guarded against. In the process of arms reduction and control in the Middle East, it is necessary to avoid aggravating the imbalance and instability in the Middle East region. The unbalanced situation now existing in the Middle East region should be corrected.

He said: China supports the establishment of a zone without nuclear weapons and large-scale destructive weapons in the Middle East. The countries in that region should destroy these types of weapons and their research and development and production facilities. The nuclear facilities in that region should be placed under the International Atomic Energy Agency's security guarantee [an quan bao zhang 1344 0356 0202 7140]. Countries other than those in the Middle East region should promise not to supply to that region these types of weapons and the special technologies, accessories, and parts for their research and development and production. At the same time, countries not in the Middle East region in possession of such large-scale destructive weapons should assume the obligation of not using such weapons against the Middle East region or deploying such weapons there.

Liu Huaqiu said China holds that the armed forces of all countries should be used only for purposes of self-defense, and that no country should seek to attain an armament level beyond reasonable defense needs. He urged those developed countries exporting large quantities of weapons to the Middle East not to use arms sales in seeking hegemony.

Referring to the question of openness of the arms trade, Liu Huaqiu said: In principle, China has no objection to discussing openness of the arms trade, but this question involves the sovereignty, security, and interests not only of seller countries but also buyer countries. Because of this, when discussing the question, it is necessary to consider and take into account the interests of both sellers and buyers countries.

Liu Huaqiu pointed out: The question of arms control in the Middle East region is inseparably linked to a fair and comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East issue. For this reason, while solving the arms control question in the Middle East, it is necessary to bring about the return of the occupied territories of Arab countries and to restore the legal national rights of Palestinians in accordance with relevant UN Security

Council resolutions. In the meantime, the sovereignty and security of Israel should also be respected and guaranteed.

In conclusion, Liu Huaqiu said: The final settlement of the issue of arms control in the Middle East requires the participation of all Middle East countries. To realize arms control in the Middle East region, it is necessary to fully respect and heed the opinions and proposals of the Middle East countries and to guard against a few countries monopolizing the whole affair and imposing their will on others. The United Nations and its Security Council as well as multilateral arms control and disarmament mechanisms, such as disarmament talks, should play their role to the full in arms control and the peace process in the Middle East. A UN or regional conference on disarmament in the Middle East attended by all Middle East countries should be held when necessary.

#### 'Reservations' on Communiqué

OW1007051991 Beijing XINHUA in English  
0458 GMT 10 Jul 91

[Text] Paris, July 9 (XINHUA)—The five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council agreed today to support a weapons of mass destruction-free zone in the Middle East.

A communiqué, released after a two-day meeting of the five, said that critical steps to this goal include full implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 687 and adoption by nations in the region of a comprehensive arms control program.

The program includes a freeze and ultimate elimination of ground to ground missiles in the region; submission by all nations in the region of all their nuclear activities to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards; a ban on the importation and production of nuclear weapons usable materials and agreement by all states in the region to undertake to become parties to the conventional convention as soon as it is concluded in 1992.

Prior to the closing of the meeting, Chinese delegation leader Liu Huaqiu, the deputy Chinese foreign minister, made a reservative speech, saying "we have reservations to some contents of the document."

"It should be specially pointed out that passages in the document about the program in arms transfer and disarmament in the Middle East are not well balanced," Liu noted.

In these passages, he pointed out, countries in the Middle East were asked to do something, but security, balance and stability in the region were not given full considerations. Moreover, countries beyond the region, especially big powers with massive weaponry stockpiles, were not involved.

Neither does the document include the special responsibilities of the big powers and what they should do to maintain security, balance and stability in the region, Liu pointed out.

The five countries confirmed in the communiqué that they would not transfer conventional weapons in the context that would undermine stability.

Furthermore, they also noted the threats to peace and stability posed by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and missiles.

Meanwhile, it said the five "undertook to seek effective measures of nonproliferation and arms control in a fair, reasonable, comprehensive and balanced manner on a global as well as on a regional basis."

They acknowledged that every state has the right of self-defence in accordance with the UN Charter, implying that states have also the right to acquire means to defend themselves.

"In this respect, the transfer of conventional weapons should contribute to the ability of states to meet their legitimate defence, security and national sovereignty requirements and to participate effectively in collective measures requested by the UN for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security."

The five agreed to hold further meetings periodically to review the arms transfer and nonproliferation issues.

#### Development of Strategic Missile Force Viewed

OW0407012991 Beijing Central People's Radio  
Network in Mandarin 1500 GMT 3 Jul 91

[Text] After 25 years of hard work, China's strategic missile units are now capable of launching missiles under all kinds of complex situations. These units are now equipped with various types of missiles and have a large number of supporting bases of different sizes and with different launching facilities.

China's strategic missile units were established officially on 1 July 1966. They were named at that time by the Central Military Commission as the Second Artillery Force. This name is still in use today.

Since its establishment, the vast number of officers and men of this modern force have not disappointed the party and the people. They have worked hard for several decades in sparsely populated plateaus, mountains, and deserts and built a large number of modern bases with offensive, defense, and storage capacity.

The Second Artillery Force has a technical force made up primarily of chief engineers. Advanced science and technology has been in use in the feasibility study, development, testing, and designing of weapons as well as in launching, maintaining, and managing them. Over the last four years, units under the Second Artillery Force

have successfully launched many missiles of different types, and all missiles hit their targets accurately.

The Second Artillery Force also has strong support to ensure fighters' living necessities and command from the rear in time of war. It also has the readiness to deal with emergencies and provide logistics support in battlefields.

### **World Disarmament Trends Analyzed**

*HK1107123291 Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI in Chinese  
No 12, 16 Jun 91 pp 28-29*

[Article by Hu Yumin (5170 6276 7044) and Mou Changlin (3664 7022 2651): "Analysis of International Disarmament Trends"]

[Text] The Gulf war has produced a major impact on world military affairs and affected the international disarmament process. But in a situation of East-West relaxation, the general trend of world disarmament still remains.

### **New Progress Likely To Appear in East-West Disarmament**

U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Reduction Talks entered a deadlock early this year. Because no treaty was signed, the United States postponed the U.S.-Soviet summit scheduled for February. The United States and its European allies deliberately accused the Soviet Union of reorganizing three motorized infantry divisions and over 3,000 heavy weapons into the Soviet Navy's coastal defense forces to evade disarmament. The situation was delicate at that time. There were differences on the details of the treaty, apart from effects caused by the Gulf war. The Soviet Union was worried over the superiority of Western hi-tech weapons in the Gulf war and the increasing U.S. military presence in the region. "Linking" the disarmament talks to the turbulent situation in the Soviet Union, the United States also had misgivings about Soviet domestic and foreign policies.

Despite worries on both sides, the basis for concluding an agreement still remained, namely, U.S.-Soviet relaxation. Therefore, U.S. and Soviet arms control policies did not change after the Gulf war. Both sides carried out disarmament and adjustments of their nuclear and conventional weapons according to the framework of the treaty. The new U.S. national defense report indicates that the United States will reduce its national defense budget to \$295.2 billion in fiscal year 1992, \$3.7 billion less than the last fiscal year. The United States has planned to reduce its military forces from 2.1 million to 1.6 million within 5 years, while on the other hand dismantling some military bases in the country and abroad and reducing the number of troops stationed in Europe. Troubled by its domestic political and economic situation, the Soviet Union expressed its readiness to reduce its national defense budget. After the completion of a 500,000-troop reduction, it will continue to disarm tens of thousands of soldiers. All Soviet troops stationed in East Europe will be withdrawn before 1995. To break

the deadlock, Bush recently sent a letter to Gorbachev demanding "renewed efforts" from him. The Soviet Union stated that all differences at the talks "can be resolved." After the Gulf war, U.S.-Soviet relations changed and developed. On 1 June foreign ministers of the two countries announced that both sides had found a solution to the problems at the talks on disarmament of conventional weapons in Europe; they also instructed their countries' representatives to resolve the problems left over from the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks.

### **Two Problems Became More Prominent Concerning "Hot Spot" Regions**

The arms race is an important factor in the outbreak of wars in the Gulf region and other parts of the Middle East. Over the last few years, half of the weapons purchased by Third World nations have entered the Middle East. Most of these weapons came from the superpowers and developed nations, and some were weapons remaining after European disarmament. Suppliers of technology and equipment for the production of chemical weapons in the region are largely Western nations. After the outbreak of the Gulf crisis, while preventing other nations from selling weapons to the Middle East, the United States "maintained a balance" in its large-scale arms sales to the region. Since last August, Saudi Arabia alone had purchased \$10-billion worth of weapons from the United States. The Soviet Union also refused to unilaterally undertake the responsibility of not providing weapons to Iraq. It pointed out that it would carry on its arms sales to the Middle East at the request of Iran and Syria. To preserve their traditional weapons markets, West European nations also competed with the United States. In addition, some small and medium-sized nations in the region stepped up their efforts for defense after the Gulf war. Israel took the opportunity for arms expansion. When purchasing weapons from big powers, some countries also demanded "military protection" from them. Kuwait allowed the stationing of U.S. troops in the country, and Saudi Arabia agreed to U.S. storage of weapons and equipment there.

Big powers' contention for arms sales to the Middle East after the Gulf war has increased the international community's sense of urgency with regard to controlling the arms race in "hot spot" regions. Appeals are rising for stabilizing the Middle East situation by positive measures and setting up a fair and effective organization to control military trade and arms transfers. On 3 April this year the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 687 demanding "overall arms control" in the Middle East and proposing making the Middle East a nonnuclear zone. World public opinion pointed out that making the Middle East a nonnuclear zone is significant in halting the arms race in the region and stopping the proliferation of chemical weapons, missiles, and other hi-tech weapons in the region. This also corresponds with the long-term interests of the nations in the region.

### Major World Countries Pay More Attention to Military High Technology

Appeals are rising around the world for arms control, but contention for military high technology is affecting disarmament at present. Thus far East-West arms control talks have still focused on limitations of weapons, instead of restricting qualitative development. The important role of hi-tech weapons in the Gulf war has encouraged many countries in the world to strive for qualitative improvement of weapons.

While deciding to reduce military expenditures, the Bush administration intended to raise expenditures for new weaponry research from \$34.55 billion in fiscal 1991 to \$39.92 billion, an increase of 15 percent. This is the only item with the largest-scale increase in the U.S. defense budget for fiscal 1992. In the next few years, the United States will continue to proceed with its plan for modernization of offensive strategic weapons and expedite the manufacture and development of land-based mobile missiles. Now the U.S. Department of Defense has already started developing new generation hi-tech weapons.

The Gulf war has made the Soviet Union seriously ill at ease about its weapons development program and the gap between its military technology and the West's. The Supreme Soviet has asked the government and the military to "formulate a new defense theory based on this war." According to a Western disclosure, the Soviet Union has not stopped its weapons modernization program. It is now researching five or six new types of missiles and is devoting its efforts to the development of strategic bombers, air-launched cruise missiles, long-range sea-launched missiles, large aircraft carriers, and new-type strategic missile submarines, as well as laser, electromagnetic, and particle-beam weapons, aiming to catch up with the West in terms of weapons quality.

In the course of developing their nuclear forces, Britain and France have also planned to devote more financial resources to building their conventional forces, with the focus on small-scale, well-equipped, and fast-responding mobile units, to cope with future wars.

This armament trend in many large countries has cast a shadow on world disarmament.

### Arms Proliferation Complicates North-South Conflicts

During the last few years Western nations have raised their call for preventing the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and missiles. The Soviet attitude

began to change in June 1990 when it signed a joint statement with the United States on nonproliferation of weapons and a treaty on chemical weapons. Now Western nations are widely publicizing strengthening nonproliferation, the aim being, as they assert, to reduce the threat to world peace and stability. But their real purpose is to restrict Third World nations' military potential and supervise their technological capacity.

Saddam Husayn kept threatening to use chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons during the Gulf war. This provided the West with the pretext of prohibiting the proliferation of these weapons. They made more effort to coordinate their action for nonproliferation. In the latter half of March, 15 Western nations gathered in Tokyo to discuss the problem of "missiles and their technological control systems" and the expansion of the scope of control. They decided to hold another meeting in Washington in November to further discuss these problems. Prior to this, Bush proposed an "initiative for preventing hi-tech proliferation," suggesting the establishment of an international organization to exercise control and supervision over exports to Third World nations of equipment for the manufacture of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. In May, the "Australia Group," composed of 20 nations, including the United States, Japan, Australia, and West European countries, also concluded an agreement on imposing mandatory restrictions on the exports of chemical materials. On 16 May of this year the United States formally announced that it gave up the right to retaliate with chemical weapons, stating that the United States will destroy all 30,000 tons of chemical weapons within 10 years from the date the treaty on banning chemical weapons comes into effect. Obviously, the United States will no longer use chemical weapons as a deterrent in the course of developing hi-tech weapons. In addition, after reexamining its arms control policy, the United States decided to change its passive position at the talks on multilateral prohibition of chemical weapons by shifting the pressure onto the Third World to set up a system for nonproliferation of chemical weapons headed by the West. At present, Western nations are active in intensifying the supervisory role of the "treaty on nuclear nonproliferation" and are urging "nuclear threshold" nations to accept the International Atomic Energy Organization's protective and supervisory measures. This situation suggests that in the 1990's, reinforcing the nonproliferation system will still remain a key issue in the arms control policy of the West. The contention over nonproliferation will become more complicated.

## NORTH KOREA

### Pullout of Nuclear Weapons From South Urged

SK1707104891 *Pyongyang KCNA in English*  
1024 GMT 17 Jul 91

[“Pullout of Nukes From South Korea is Urgent Demand for Peace in Asia”—KCNA headline]

[Text] Pyongyang, July 17 (KCNA)—To pull the U.S. nuclear weapons out of South Korea is a most urgent demand for peace and security in Asia, stresses NODONG SINMUN in a by-lined article today.

The article says:

In his answers to questions raised by the editor-in-chief of the Japanese MAINICHI SHIMBUN and the president of the KYODO News Service of Japan the great leader Comrade Kim Il-song stressed the need to struggle in defence of peace and security in Asia and clearly indicated ways to this end.

If peace and security is to be ensured in Asia, it is necessary, above all, to get the U.S. imperialists' military bases and armed forces withdrawn, especially, their mass destruction weapons including nuclear weapons removed. The most urgent requirement here is the pullout of the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Because the U.S. imperialists have turned South Korea into a most important stronghold for their Asian aggression and are pursuing a most adventurous and dangerous strategy of strength in reliance on it.

Having deployed their more than 40,000 troops and 1,000 odd pieces of nuclear weapons in South Korea, they are not infrequently staging nuclear war games under various names including the large-scale “Team Spirit” joint military exercises.

If they unleashed another war against the North on the Korean peninsula under such conditions, its flames would spread all over the expanse of Asia and turn into a nuclear war.

The U.S. nuclear weapons present in South Korea are not a “shield” for deterring “threat” from someone. They are “spears” intended to overwhelm our people and other Asian people with strength and establish domination over the Asia-Pacific region.

It is entirely because the U.S. imperialists continue pursuing their policy of nuclear blackmail, regarding South Korea as a colony and military base, as a nuclear forward base, that the danger of war has not been removed from the Korean peninsula and the situation in the Asia-Pacific region not improved still today.

While talking about the end of the cold war era and the advent of the era of peace, they are still persisting in their policy of violating the sovereignty of countries in the Asia-Pacific and dominating them by dint of strength. This is totally anachronistic.

The Asian people must firmly unite and cooperate with one another and struggle for the withdrawal of the U.S. imperialists' aggressive military bases and troops from this region and thus turn the Asia-Pacific region into a peace zone free from war and nuclear weapons.

The Korean people will vigorously struggle to get the U.S. troops and nuclear weapons withdrawn from South Korea and guarantee peace and security in this region with the support of the Asia people, holding aloft the banner of independence, peace and friendship, stresses the article.

### U.S. Paper Cited on U.S. Troops, Weapons Withdrawal

SK1507063191 *Pyongyang KCNA in English*  
0502 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Pyongyang, July 15 (KCNA)—The U.S. newspaper International Herald Tribune June 27 dealing with the way of denuclearisation on the Korean peninsula demanded the withdrawal of the U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Referring to the principled stand of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the problem of nuclear inspection, the paper urged the United States to allow an international inspection of its nuclear bases in South Korea.

It said the withdrawal of the U.S. nuclear weapons from South Korea will contribute to confidence-building in Korea and remove the danger of war from this region.

Asking why the United States must withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea, the paper said it is because these nuclear weapons threaten peace and security in Asia and constitute the main obstacle to North-South confidence-building and disarmament.

The paper demanded that the United States take a decisive step to withdraw its nuclear weapons from South Korea.

It stressed that a nuclear-free zone must be created from the Korean peninsula.

### Solidarity Group Statement on U.S. Nuclear Arms

SK0907065091 *Pyongyang KCNA in English*  
0452 GMT 9 Jul 91

[Text] Pyongyang, July 9 (KCNA)—The United States must not disregard the desire and demand of the Korean people, the peoples in Asia and the rest of the world to eliminate nuclear weapons and build a peaceful new world but must pull its nuclear weapons out of South Korea without delay, said Yi Song-ho, vice-chairman of the Korean Committee for Solidarity With the World People, in a statement issued to the press on July 8 clarifying the justice of the DPRK's stand made clear in the joint statement of its political parties and public organizations.

The deployment of more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear weapons in South Korea by the U.S. imperialists is aimed at dominating the whole of Korea and Asia with strength and threatening and containing any Asian country with nuclear weapons under the plausible name of "defense" of the U.S. interests and security in case any events that might go against the grain with them should occur in this region, he noted.

The United States set it as the chief goal of its global strategy to establish domination and control over the Asia-Pacific region and is invariably pursuing its policy of strength, continually maintaining strong military forces in this region, he said, and stressed:

The United States must give up its foolish dream of settling all issues with nuclear weapons, persisting in its policy of strength against the trend of the times.

#### Withdrawal of Nuclear Weapons in Asia Urged

*SK0907110191 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
1024 GMT 9 Jul 91*

[“There is no Justification for Keeping Nuclear Weapons in South Korea”—KCNA headline]

[Text] Pyongyang, July 9 (KCNA)—NODONG SINMUN today stresses that the United States has no justification for keeping nuclear weapons in South Korea.

Recalling that U.S. expert of Asia affairs Prof. Scalapino, former president of California University; Taylor, deputy director of the U.S. Centre for Strategic and International Studies; Crowe, former chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Laroque, director of the U.S. Defence Information Centre who have been involved in the U.S. global strategy, Asia-Pacific strategy and policy toward Korea and personally visited the North and the South of the Korean peninsula, asserted that it is unnecessary to deploy nuclear weapons in South Korea, the news analyst of the paper says:

Their remarks draw attention in the sense of the views of U.S. experts in military affairs, information and foreign policy.

The assertion of the U.S. experts admits that the deployment of nuclear weapons in South Korea do so harm but not any good for the United States. This means that the U.S. pretext for the preservation of nuclear weapons in South Korea is invalid.

One of the pretexts was to "deter the downward thrust" of the Soviet Union.

It is reported that the Soviet-U.S. relations transferred from confrontation to detente and both sides do not regard the other side as "enemy" any longer. Under such condition, the United States has no reason to keep nuclear weapons in South Korea.

If the U.S. claim for nuclear disarmament, detente and peaceful solution of disputes is true, there is no need for the United States to keep more than 1,000 pieces of nuclear weapons in South Korea.

The U.S. authorities, however, are trying to keep them in South Korea, motivated by their wild ambition to keep hold on South Korea as a nuclear forward base largest in the Far East, not for "security" in this region, ignite a nuclear war on the Korean peninsula and realize their domination over Asia.

They need another shocking pretext to avoid the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from South Korea and justify their nuclear war policy. It is just a fictitious "nuclear threat from North Korea".

The U.S. advertisement about "nuclear threat from North Korea" does not convince any one but becomes a laughing-stock to those who have common sense. It is because the fictitious "nuclear threat from North Korea" is utterly preposterous.

The United States' loud advertisement about bogus "nuclear threat from the North" only proves that there is no justification for the United States to keep nuclear weapons in South Korea.

If the United States truly wants detente and peace on the Korean peninsula, it should lend an ear to voices of public circles of the United States, reexamine its policy toward Korea and withdraw nuclear weapons for South Korea.

#### Solidarity Chairman Demands Nuclear-Free Zone

*SK0707083191 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
0808 GMT 7 Jul 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, July 7 (KCNA)—Kim Kuk-hun, chairman of the Korean Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity, demanded that the United States take practical measures to make the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone and remove the nuclear threat to Korea and Asia.

In his statement issued July 6 in support of our just stand set out in the joint statement of the DPRK political parties and public organisations, he said:

The United States has deployed nuclear weapons in South Korea, with a view to dominating Korea and Asia and threatening and containing any country with nuclear weapons in case events which might go against the grain with them occur in this region.

The U.S. clamor over "nuclear inspection" on the DPRK is another shameless act conducted by it today when it can no longer plead for the unreasonable deployment of its nuclear weapons in South Korea, and an intrigue to inflict a nuclear holocaust on the Korean people and other Asian people.

If the United States is to settle the nuclear inspection" problem fairly, it must not slander the DPRK which has

no intention nor capability to produce nuclear weapons, is ready to sign the Nuclear Safeguards Accord under the non-proliferation treaty any time and is not opposed to nuclear inspection, but must open to the public its nuclear bases in South Korea and allow a simultaneous international inspection of them.

The Korean committee for Afro-Asian solidarity will do all it can in unity with Asian people to force the U.S. troops and nuclear weapons to withdraw from South Korea and convert the Korean peninsula and Asia into a nuclear-free, peace zone.

#### Peace Committee Statement on Nuclear Issue

SK0607042291 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
0404 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Pyongyang, July 6 (KCNA)—Chong Chun-ki, chairman of the Korea National Peace Committee, issued a statement on July 5 denouncing the U.S. demand for unilateral “nuclear inspection” of the DPRK as an arrogant act of a big power for imposing its will on others.

The statement said:

The United States and the South Korean authorities demand a unilateral “nuclear inspection” of the DPRK, a non-nuclear state. Lurking behind it is the sinister intention to divert elsewhere the attention of the world from the nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and conceal their policy of nuclear blackmail to dominate the whole of Korea and Asian countries.

If nuclear inspection is to be made, it must not be made of the DPRK alone that has no nuclear weapons, but the U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea must be opened to the public and a simultaneous international inspection be made of them.

No one can vouch that the United States would not wield the nuclear weapons against Asian countries by inventing some pretexts to realise its dominationist ambition, and no one can predict which country would be targeted by the nuclear weapons in South Korea.

If the danger of nuclear war is to be removed from the Korean peninsula and Asia, the nuclear weapons of the U.S. Army in South Korea, the source of nuclear war, must be withdrawn, first of all, and the Korean peninsula be turned into a nuclear-free zone.

Chong Chun-ki expressed the belief that the peaceloving peoples and peace organisations in Asia and the rest of the world would continue to express firm solidarity with the Korean people’s struggle to get the U.S. nuclear weapons withdrawn from South Korea and make the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free, peace zone.

#### Soviet Official, Other Figures Cited on Nuclear Issue

SK0607045591 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
0416 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Pyongyang, July 6 (KCNA)—Louder voices are ringing out in the international arena in support of the joint statement of the political parties and public organizations of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea with regard to the ever more grave nuclear threat by the United States on the Korean peninsula.

M. Kruglov, vice-chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, in his statement to the press said that the Soviet Government supports this joint statement.

In his talk, the general secretary of the Lebanese Progressive Youth Organization, denounced the U.S. policy against the DPRK’s proposals for national reunification and other peaceful overtures and strongly demanded that the United States withdraw its troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Christopher Magola, deputy editor-in-chief of the radio broadcasting station of Tanzania, in an article accused the Western media of raising an outcry demanding “nuclear inspection” of North Korea. He held that a peace agreement must be concluded between the DPRK and the United States and a nonaggression declaration be adopted between the North and the South and the reunification through confederacy be realized for a durable peace on the Korean peninsula.

The general secretary of the United Student Organization of Bangladesh, in a statement to the press exposed the U.S. imperialists’ policy of nuclear blackmail and their nuclear war provocation moves on the Korean peninsula.

#### Japanese Paper Cited on for Nuclear Weapons

SK0607104991 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
1008 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Pyongyang, July 6 (KCNA)—The Japanese newspaper MAINICHI SHIMBUN July 4 carried an editorial headlined “Is It Impossible To Remove Nuclear [Facilities] From Korean Peninsula”.

Referring to debates on the question of “inspection” of “nuclear facilities” of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the paper said that in this connection North Korea strongly calls for the inspection of the U.S. troops’ nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea and their pullout as a condition to accept the “nuclear inspection” of its country.

A nuclear power is under an obligation to pose no nuclear threat upon a non-nuclear state, the paper said, and went on:

In this respect, it is not that the North Korean side has no ground.

Specialists or commentaries of leading newspapers of the United States say that the strategic significance of the nuclear [facilities] deployed in South Korea has been drastically decreased today when "cold war has come to an end".

The benefit of the "termination of cold war" should reach Asia, too. To remove nuclear threat from the Korean peninsula is a great concern of the Japanese people.

But, "the South Korean 'government' is against the nuclear pullout of the U.S. Army and the United States is not confirming the existence of nuclear [facilities]". "It is high time that all countries concerned including the United States began to examine the denuclearization of the whole of the Korean peninsula as an actual matter".

#### **Head of Lawyers Group Views U.S. Nuclear Stand**

*SK0507052891 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
0451 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Text] Pyongyang, July 5 (KCNA)—The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a nuclear-free state, has an undisputed legitimate right to demand that the U.S. imperialists remove the nuclear threat against it and commit themselves to nuclear safeguards and the United States, a nuclear state, has an unavoidable legal obligation to respond to our demand in accordance with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Choe In-ki, secretary general of the Korean lawyers association, said this in his statement issued to the press on July 4 clarifying the justness of our stand in the joint statement of the political parties and public organizations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

He said that demand of the U.S. imperialists for unilateral "nuclear inspection" of the DPRK is another shameless act committed by them today when they cannot find any longer an excuse to justify the presence of their nuclear weapons in South Korea and a mean criminal intrigue to invent a pretext to impose nuclear calamities upon the Korean people and the Asian people.

Declaring that we have no nuclear weapons and have neither intention nor capacity to develop them, he said: The United States is getting frantic in spreading false rumours that we are "developing them" while resorting to the disgraceful smear campaign against us in league with the South Korean puppets, Japan and other satellite states. It is the height of impudence and high-handed interference in our people's sovereignty.

He stressed that if the United States truly wants the removal of nuclear threat, it must eliminate the factors of nuclear threat against the DPRK, make a legal commitment to nuclear safeguards, open to the public the nuclear weapons and bases in South Korea and allow a simultaneous international inspection of them.

#### **Denunciations of U.S. Nuclear Threat Cited**

*SK0507151891 Pyongyang KCNA in English  
1501 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[“World Public Voices Denouncing U.S. Nuclear Threat to Korea”—KCNA headline]

[Text] Pyongyang, July 5 (KCNA)—The Asian Regional Institute of the Chuche Idea in its statement strongly denounced the U.S. nuclear threat to Korea, noting that it is getting more dangerous.

Demanding an immediate withdrawal of the U.S. forces from South Korea with their nuclear weapons, it contends that nuclear inspection should not be made of the North of Korea alone but the nuclear bases of the United States in South Korea be opened to the public and international inspection be made simultaneously of them.

The people's front of workers, peasants and students of Peru, noted in its statement that more than 1,000 nuclear weapons of the United States deployed in South Korea threaten the security not only of the Korean people but also of the peoples of Asia and the world.

The real purpose of the United States is to dominate the whole of Korea and Asia, it noted, and added: If the danger of a nuclear war is to be removed from the Korean peninsula, the United States must withdraw its nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea without delay and the Korean peninsula be turned into a nuclear-free, peace zone.

The chairman of the Diplomatic Club of India said in his statement it is a big-power chauvinistic arbitrariness for the United States to vilify the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that has no nuclear weapons over the problem of "nuclear inspection".

The United States must renounce its anachronistic mode of thinking whereby it tries to force its will upon others from the position of strength and must pay attention to the voices of the world people demanding peace.

#### **NEW ZEALAND**

##### **Minister 'Angry' at Latest French Nuclear Test**

*BK1607043491 Hong Kong AFP in English 0427 GMT  
16 Jul 91*

[Text] Wellington, July 16 (AFP)—France exploded a nuclear bomb at its Mururoa Atoll test site in French Polynesia early Tuesday, New Zealand's Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) said in a statement.

They estimated the explosion, the sixth in the latest series this year, at around 35 kilotons.

The test drew an angry statement from Foreign Minister Don McKinnon who had previously been restrained in

his criticism of the latest series of tests, which began May 8. There are usually six tests in a series.

"We are sick and tired of the French nuclear tests," he said.

The DSIR said in a statement the test at 6:10 A.M. New Zealand time (1810 GMT Monday) was registered on their seismological equipment at Rarotonga in the Cook Islands.

The latest series included a test with an estimated yield of 110 kilotons, one of the largest ever French tests, and one of less than half a kiloton.

The combined estimated yield of the six tests was put at 190 kilotons.

Mr. McKinnon said the tests showed how the French Government continued to misjudge the mood of the South Pacific.

He said the tests were coming at a time when the cold war had ended and the security situation in Europe had changed.

When the latest series started New Zealand stopped protesting after each test, preferring to protest at the commencement of each series.

Mr. McKinnon said this had been interpreted by some as a weakening of New Zealand opposition, but this was not the case.

"The procedure (of protesting) may have changed, but nothing other than a cessation of the tests will cause the New Zealand Government to change its policy of vocal opposition.

### Scientists Record French Nuclear Test

*BK1507044691 Hong Kong AFP in English 0401 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[Text] Wellington, July 15 (AFP)—New Zealand scientists said Monday that a French nuclear test recorded earlier this month was the equivalent of only 500 tonnes of TNT, the smallest they have ever detected.

Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) Chief Seismologist Warwick Smith said the test on Mururoa atoll in French Polynesia took place on July 5 at 6 A.M. New Zealand Time (1800 GMT July 4).

It had been announced at the time by French authorities who said it had a yield of less than 10 kilotons.

The test was picked up on equipment in Rarotonga, Cook Islands, which was partly bought with compensation paid to New Zealand by France in settlement for sinking the Greenpeace protest ship Rainbow Warrior in Auckland harbour in 1985.

Mr. Smith said the DSIR had had to wait until magnetic tapes were flown here from Rarotonga before seeing if

they had picked up the blast. "It was so small it was right on the threshold of being detectable," he said.

### Second French Award Causes 'Another Upset'

*BK1407053091 Hong Kong AFP in English 0506 GMT 14 Jul 91*

[Text] Wellington, July 14 (AFP)—A report that an award has been given to a colonel who held high position in the French secret service at the time of the Rainbow Warrior bombing has caused another upset in relations between France and New Zealand.

Radio New Zealand reported Colonel Jean-Claude Lesquer had been made a commander of the Legion of Honour, saying he was head of the action branch of the French secret service when the Greenpeace ship was sunk by saboteurs in Auckland harbour six years ago.

Two weeks ago one of the bombers, Alain Mafart, was given a long-service award. The news drew a strong protest from Wellington and a few days later France exploded another nuclear device at Mururoa Atoll in the Pacific.

New Zealand and other regional governments oppose the test programme.

Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Don McKinnon said Sunday the government was waiting for confirmation from its Paris embassy of the radio report about the decoration of Col. Lesquer.

"If it is correct then of course I'm irritated," Mr. McKinnon said.

"It's a case of more bad timing and more insensitivity. I'm left wondering how much longer this sorry saga in New Zealand-France relations is going to continue eating away at the positive links between our two countries.

"Like any New Zealander, I'm upset that the Rainbow Warrior affair continues to haunt us like this."

The radio report noted that Col. Lesquer had been second in command of French land forces during the gulf war and it was not clear whether the award related directly to that.

Mr. McKinnon said he would not begrudge anyone a medal for playing a part in the multinational Gulf forces but added: "No-one should be rewarded for being associated with an act of international terrorism."

Wellington reacted to the award given to Mr. Mafart by downgrading its representation at a French national day reception to be hosted in Wellington Sunday by Ambassador Gabriel de Bellescize.

Neither Prime Minister Jim Bolger nor Mr. McKinnon will attend and the government will be represented by Revenue Minister Wyatt Creech, the lowest-ranking member of the cabinet.

Mr. Creech said when he was chosen to attend the reception that the decision had been made because of his cabinet ranking.

"The government is not impressed with what the French have done," he said.

Mr. De Bellescize is expected to defend the Mafart award when he speaks at the reception.

Anti-nuclear groups have said they plan to protest the Park Royal Hotel where the reception is to be held.

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

### Deputy Defense Minister on Stationing of Soviet Nuclear Arms

*AU0507114191 Prague CESKE A MORAVSKOSLEZSKE ZEMEDELSKE NOVINY in Czech 4 Jul 91 p 1*

[Interview with Major General Karel Pezl, deputy defense minister and Army chief of General Staff, by Jan Bauer; place and date not given: "It Is Likely That Nuclear Ammunition Was Here"—first paragraph is CESKE A MORAVSKOSLEZSKE ZEMEDELSKE NOVINY introduction]

[Text] The validity of the Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty on the stationing of bases with nuclear weapons on our territory ended on 27 June 1991. At this occasion, Zdenek Zikmund, deputy director of the press department of the CSFR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said that the fact that this type of weapon was deployed on our territory has not been confirmed. We have asked Karel Pezl, Czechoslovak Army General Staff chief and CSFR deputy defense minister, what is the truth:

[Pezl] Special-purpose buildings for storing nuclear weapons were built on our territory. The procedures for their defense and protection were such that no one from our side—or even the Soviet officials that did not belong to those who directly guarded and operated these buildings—had permission to enter. None of our citizens has seen nuclear warheads being transported and stored in these buildings. Yet, from the nature of these buildings, it can be unequivocally inferred that nuclear ammunition was stored here. Highly precise tests carried out after these buildings were taken over have not confirmed any indications of increased radioactivity. However, this does not exclude the previous presence of nuclear ammunition. The Soviet side itself has not denied or confirmed its storage.

[Bauer] It was stated at a previous session of the Federal Government that the Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty on the storage of nuclear ammunition was concluded in a manner violating the valid constitution. Can someone be retroactively prosecuted for this?

[Pezl] I am not a lawyer and I cannot give you a reliable answer on this. However, I am of the opinion that, in view of the fact that former defense ministers, Lomsky and Dzur, who signed this treaty, are dead, it is most likely that no prosecution will be launched.

## HUNGARY

### General Annus on Soviet Troop Withdrawal

*AU0507085191 Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian 3 Jul 91 p 6*

[Interview with Lieutenant General Antal Annus, administrative state secretary at the Ministry of Defense,

by Janos Desi; place and date not given: "They Did Not Believe That They Had To Leave—They Constantly Threatened Us—It Was Decided in March—Anti-Soviet Feelings as a Negotiating Tactic—40 Billion Forints Demand"—first two paragraphs are MAGYAR NEMZET introduction]

[Text] Antal Annus is the government commissioner entrusted with dealing with the issues of the Soviet troop withdrawal, and he also heads the financial negotiations. He completed his general staff studies in Moscow; he was a combat officer in his previous career in the Army. His final tour was as commander of the Tata mechanized regiment. He was appointed as the general deputy to the chief of staff on 1 March 1990. He already had participated in organizing the troop withdrawals. On 12 March 1991, when the first Soviet units left for home, by the side of the loading ramps at Hajmasker, Foreign State Secretary Ferenc Somogyi told Annus that he would probably become the government commissioner with complete responsibility for directing the withdrawals on behalf of the Hungarian Government.

Although the Soviet troops have left the territory of the Hungarian Republic, they left numerous unclear issues behind. According to the experts, it is almost certain that Hungary will not have to pay for the withdrawal, in spite of the existing Soviet demands. Of course, many things can still happen between now and the final agreement. Therefore, we asked Government Commissioner Antal Annus not only about the chances of the financial settlement, but we also asked him to recall some of the details of the negotiations. Antal Annus began the interview by saying that at the time he accepted his assignment, he was already aware of the fact that the troop withdrawal was not only a military and technical issue but also a political matter, especially since the agreement on withdrawal was not politically settled:

[Annus] The CSFR signed the protocol on the withdrawal of Soviet troops in such a way that the Soviet Union apologized for the 1968 events. The Hungarian-Soviet agreement on troop withdrawals did not have such a political basis. The way the Soviet troops came to Hungary, the reason they stayed, and an assessment of the 1956 events were completely missing, and we can still feel the effects of this. I declared that 1956 was an occupation and one-sided agreements were forced upon us; therefore, it would be very strange if the Soviets received complete compensation for everything they built here, especially since they caused serious damages during their stay here. Therefore, taking these things into consideration, we can only settle our accounts after they complete the pull-out. Well, they rather resented my opinion regarding this issue.

### Potemkin Withdrawal

[Desi] Did the senior Soviet officers you came in contact with perceive the withdrawal as a defeat or did they realize its political necessity?

[Annus] They claimed to have understood its political necessity, but everything they did reflected their disagreement with it. They made us feel that they thought we had made a bad and one-sided agreement.

[Desi] Does this mean that they tried to make the pull-out more difficult and slower?

[Annus] It is a fact that they threatened halting the pull-out if we could not come to a financial agreement. As a soldier, I assessed the situation continuously and found that they maintained positions and links until the last moment, until the spring of 1991.

[Desi] Do I understand correctly that they organized the pull-out in such a way that they could return at any moment?

[Annus] I would not put it that way. Still, they maintained the infrastructure of leadership, certain reconnaissance and strike forces, and the infrastructure of deployment. They started to break this up in March when it became clear to them that there would be no return.

[Desi] What do you think lay behind their reluctance: military and political considerations or simply the fact that the officers preferred to live here than in their home country?

[Annus] The reasons for their reluctance were strategic and military. This becomes perfectly obvious if you look through the recent speeches of Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Yazov. Other military leaders have also repeated that this way. The Soviet Union could get into a helpless position, and its borders would become defenseless without the forward buffer-zones. The fact that the officers could live on a European level here, and they could buy anything for their money undoubtedly played a role as well. A considerable number of their apartments are incomparably better than the ones in the Soviet Union, and they also had an internal network of shops, kindergartens, and infant nurseries.

### Burlakov, the Seismograph

[Desi] Were there any moments during the negotiations when you felt that the troop withdrawals could be stopped because of the domestic political situation in the Soviet Union?

[Annus] I felt that many times. Colonel General Burlakov, who was the former commander of the Soviet troops stationed here, indicated the changes in the Soviet conditions like a seismograph. He made his most fierce statements when the Soviet situation was in its most critical state.

[Desi] How were the negotiations affected by the anti-Russian and anti-Soviet feelings that at times can be experienced on various levels of Hungarian political life?

[Annus] The Soviet delegation mentioned this a number of times. Its members often found the declaration of

facts to be anti-Soviet. Burlakov and other soldiers with similar views firmly believe that Hungarians are anti-Soviet when they say that the Soviets overran Hungary in 1956—they think they came to liberate our country. I have well-founded reasons to assume that they created a scandal many times in order to remove me from my position as head of the negotiating delegation.

[Desi] How did they do it? Did they complain about you?

[Annus] Yes, they did, but I do not wish to expand on that just now.

[Desi] Is it possible that the Hungarian delegation also tried to do something similar? Burlakov was removed from his position as head of the Southern Army Group before the conclusion of the withdrawal.

[Annus] We did not attempt to do anything like that. Perhaps, after a while, the prevailing political trend in Moscow could no longer put up with the sort of attitude represented by Burlakov. However, Burlakov was transferred to lead the Soviet troops in Germany. His views have not changed at all and, perhaps, he was appointed to his new post because people were satisfied with his work in Hungary.

### Did They Spy!(?)

[Desi] Let us discuss the Hungarian-Soviet financial accounting. In your opinion, who pays to whom, and how much?

[Annus] I do not think it would be a good thing to engage in such forecasts.

[Desi] What would you consider an acceptable achievement for Hungary? It seems that the two fronts have stiffened their positions at the end of the negotiations.

[Annus] The Soviet position has changed since the direct talks were discontinued. In a recent letter sent to me, Lieutenant General Shilov, the head of the Soviet delegation, not only confirms that the Soviets handed over installations worth 53 billion forints, but also admits that, on the basis of the methods accepted by both sides, we have justified claims of 14 billion forints due to their failure to maintain the building they have been using. We also agreed that the Soviet environmental protection group would continue its activity until 3 July; this means that they also recognize the existence of methods worked out to evaluate the environmental damages because they are working according to these methods. On the basis of Shilov's letter, I think that they will propose the following at our next meeting: Their claim amounts to 54 billion forints, minus the 14 billion forints due us for their failure to maintain the buildings, and the difference is 40 billion forints; we should pay this amount. Obviously, we will reply that they should consider all the agreements, not only one. For example, according to the agreement signed in 1958, we do not have to pay for things that are useless for us. In their view, all the

relevant agreements have lost their validity with the conclusion of the troop withdrawal but, according to expert lawyers, these agreements are still retroactively valid. Out of the installations they handed over to us, we do not need 29 billion forints worth of installations. If we also deduct this amount from their claim, there will only be 11 billion forints. We have not yet mentioned the greatest Hungarian demand: the more than 60 billion forints due to us for environmental damage—but this could naturally change in the course of future negotiations.

[Desi] Does the fact that the overwhelming majority of Hungarian officers graduated in the Soviet Union represent some kind of advantage or disadvantage during the negotiations? Have the negotiating partners tried to ascertain each other's views, for example by means of spying?

[Annus] There is no spying involved here. I also graduated in Moscow because there was no other possibility. The time I spent there was useful to get to know each other. It is an advantage for me that, being aware of their way of thinking, I could guess their reactions.

#### Withdrawal Statistics

The Defense Ministry does not have exact data on the number of Soviet troops deployed in Hungary until the end of the eighties. The only thing we know is the timing and the type and size of units that have been withdrawn from Hungary, on the basis of Soviet information.

As a start, the Soviet Union carried out a unilateral troops withdrawal in 1989, when they withdrew an entire tank division, a tank training regiment, a fighter plane regiment, and several other units. A total of more than 10,000 soldiers, 470 tanks, more than 200 mortars, and more than 3,000 trucks and other military vehicles left Hungary.

A Soviet-Hungarian agreement was signed in 1990, according to which all Soviet troops had to leave Hungary between 12 March and 30 June 1991.

According to the agreement and according to information supplied by the Soviets, 100,380 people left Hungary; about half of them were soldiers, and the other half were family members and civil employees.

A total of 27,146 machines left Hungary:

regular vehicles: 21,726 pieces;  
caterpillar vehicles: 2,269 pieces;  
missiles (Scud-B and FROG): 196 pieces;  
tanks (T-22, T-55): 860 pieces;  
combat vehicles: 1,473 pieces;  
artillery: 622 pieces.

In addition, a total of 560,912 tons of ammunition, fuel, food, clothes, and other material had to be transported. This quantity of material was packed up into 17,500 containers.

Two mechanized infantry divisions left Hungary; one division left between March and December 1990, and another left between December 1990 and March 1991 (except for the unit engaged in transport work in Zahony). A mechanized infantry division is made up of three mechanized infantry regiments, a tank regiment, an artillery regiment, and an anti-aircraft artillery regiment, including its servicing units, with a total of about 12,000 soldiers.

Two missile brigades left Tata and Dombovar between March and June 1990.

Two air defense brigades and two air defense regiments left Dunafoldvar, Mor, Szolnok, and Budapest between April and July 1990.

A technical regiment and two technical battalions left Szentendre, Dunaujvaros, and Etyek between June 1991 and January 1991.

Two radio electronic battalions left Kecskemet and Piliscsaba after May 1990.

In accordance with the withdrawal agreement, the following units of the Soviet Air Force left Hungary: Headquartered in Tokol, four combat airplane divisions (made up of four regiments with about 40 airplanes in each regiment), and two combat helicopter regiments from Debrecen, Sarmellek, Tokol, Kiskunlachaza, Kunmadaras, and Kalocsa.

In addition, numerous service units and institutions, hospitals, headquarters, and staffs had to be dismantled.

The Southern Army Group left Hungary with a total of 1,547 trains, including 637 troop-carrying trains, 560 material transport trains, and 350 passenger trains. Some of the headquarters and staffs left Hungary on highways, and the airplanes left Hungary by air.

## POLAND

#### Spokesman Denies Soviet Troop Withdrawal Date Fixed

LD1207220691 Warsaw PAP in English 2031 GMT  
12 Jul 91

[Text] Warsaw, July 12—Spokesman for the Polish Foreign Minister Grzegorz Dziedowicz denied on Friday Valentin Falin's statement to the effect that the date of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland had been fixed during Wednesday's negotiations between both sides.

Falin, secretary of the Central Committee and head of the International Department of the CPSU, told a press conference in Warsaw earlier in the day that the sides had reached an agreement on the date of withdrawal, to be disclosed to the press by the Polish Foreign Ministry, and were still negotiating financial issues.

In reference to the issue of security on the European continent he said: "If we are moving towards a European system of collective security, the status of the security of each member of this system should guarantee the security of all. If we embark upon the road of the liquidation of all arsenals under tight mutual control, we will solve this problem together for all the states."

The official stated that for the Soviet Union Poland will never be part of a bargain in talks with any country. Speaking about the so-called Falin Doctrine, he said: "We cannot forget that we are neighbours and we should not treat our relations emotionally but on the basis of a fundamental plan. At a session of the CPSU Secretariat on relations with the countries of Eastern Europe it had been remarked that changes in those countries do not mean the end of the world."

In this connection Falin mentioned various links between the countries concerned, including economic ones, and added that it is necessary not to assume a pose pretending that neighbours have ceased to exist. He also spoke about friendly contacts between the CPSU and the

Social-Democratic Party of the Republic of Poland (SDRP—former Communist Party), based on the principle of sovereignty.

He stressed that the Soviet state does not make any obstacles for both Poles and people coming from other countries and living in the USSR to return to their homeland.

The official also informed newsmen that President Lech Walesa accepted an invitation sent by President Mikhail Gorbachev to visit the USSR, his visit being expected to be official and end in concrete results.

Falin, on a visit to Poland between July 11 and 14 at the invitation from the SDRP, has already met with Senate Speaker Andrzej Stelmachowski, Sejm Speaker Mikolaj Kozakiewicz, Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski, Chairman of the Democratic Union and former Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki and Chairman of the Democratic Left Caucus in the Polish Parliament Wladzimirz Cimoszewicz.

## PALESTINIAN AFFAIRS

### PLO's Abu-Sharif Urges Halt to Mideast Arms Race

NC0907091591 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0630 GMT  
9 Jul 91

[Text] Tunis, 9 July (MENA)—In a statement to MENA, Bassam Abu-Sharif, adviser to Palestinian president Yasir 'Arafat, has said that the meeting of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council on halting the export of nonconventional weapons to the Mideast region is a positive step toward building a stable and Middle East free from weapons. He added that the Middle East, which has been swept by wars throughout its history, is currently suffering a state of backwardness due to the arms race which has devoured the region's wealth and obstructed its economic development.

Abu-Sharif said: We fully support the elimination of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons from the entire region as a prelude toward changing it into a demilitarized zone.

Abu-Sharif added that the PLO, which continues to participate constructively in the peace process, appeals to the five states to speed up their efforts to end Israel's occupation of the Arab territories and lay the foundation for a permanent peace in the region. He said that, if the UN resolutions that call for ending the Israeli occupation are not implemented, the region will be swept by conflicts. He went on to say that the Arab world expects the five countries, specifically the United States, to use a single standard in dealing with international legitimacy, as has been the case in the Gulf.

Answering a question about Palestinian president Yasir 'Arafat's meeting with Prime Minister 'Atif Sidqi in Libya, Abu-Sharif said that the PLO's meetings always try to work for justice and peace. He said that the important meeting between president 'Arafat and Prime Minister Sidqi held on Monday dealt with the latest developments in the peace process and added that the talks were part of the agreement to coordinate Egypt and PLO efforts to serve the peace process and end the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories. Abu-Sharif said that the two sides also discussed the proposal for eliminating the weapons of mass destruction in the region. He noted that there was full agreement on the importance of eliminating Israel's weapons of mass destruction as well as similar weapons possessed by any other country in the region.

Abu-Sharif said that the time is ripe for Arab countries to unify their stands on Israel's procrastination regarding its withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and the recognition of the Palestinian people's right to their state. He reiterated the importance of the Saudi role in liberating Jerusalem, the first of the two Qiblahs and the third holy place.

## IRAN

### U.S. Mideast Arms Control Proposal Criticized

LD1007134691 Tehran *Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network* in Persian  
1046 GMT 10 Jul 91

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] The five permanent members of the UN Security Council ended their two-day session in Paris during which they discussed arms control. [passage omitted] U.S. President George Bush, in his proposal entitled arms control in the Middle East, suggested that a freeze be placed on the procurement and production of surface-to-surface missiles in the Middle East followed by an ultimate ban. [passage omitted] The main emphasis in this proposal is on the Middle East region, and political observers believe that the said proposals were presented to the session in light, especially, of the deployment of Soviet made Scud missiles by Iraq against Israel and Saudi Arabia during the Persian Gulf war. Another proposal was advanced at this session by the French president, on the subject of the need to limit arm sales in the world. [passage omitted]

Of course, when Bush was talking about the limitations of arms sales to the Middle East, the American secretary of state for defense was also talking about the need to send advanced military equipment required by Israel. This lays bare the contradictions between what America says and what she does in the region; for it seems that America considers it to be legitimate and lawful to sell weapons to some Middle Eastern countries if they need the weapons for their self-defense. One may well ask: How is the distinction drawn between offensive and defensive weapons? And, what authority draws this distinction? If those authorities which are to decide about the sale and export of arms are supposed to be drawn from these very exporters and producers of arms in the world then this will surely lead to the trampling of the rights of non-friendly countries and the granting of more benefits to those authorities' allies. And in the event that the ban on the sale of arms to the Middle East region is endorsed by the next conference of the world's seven industrial countries, then the problems of Palestine and the regime occupying Jerusalem and the peace conference in the Middle East should be viewed and discussed as a step toward decreasing tensions and existing pitfalls.

In light of America's urge to preserve the existence of the al-Qods regime and because it has secured the equipment and facilities needed in the past by that regime, the Arab countries of the Middle East have a very important motive for wanting access to modern, advanced military weapons so that they may be able to respond to Israel's military threats. And, in reality, so that they may maintain a kind of military balance in the region.

Alongside the Arab countries of the region there are non-Arab countries which will have a need for advanced technology weapons so that they may be able to prevent

interference and aggression. Political observers believe that U.S. President George Bush by having coined the term "the new world order," intends, under any circumstance, to retain control of this region which he acquired after the Persian Gulf war.

At the end of the session, the five members of the Security Council called for acceptance by all Middle East countries for international control over their nuclear activities. [passage omitted] However, the outstanding question that remains is whether or not Israel's atomic installations are also going to be subjected to this inspection and control? And, have all countries sought atomic technology with military usage in mind? Evidently the majority of the region's countries which are about to acquire atomic technology, wish to use it not for military but for economic objectives.

In any case, despite the fact that the above mentioned countries are the biggest producers and exporters of weapons in the world and even if their military industries are flourishing, can a reduction in the sale and production of weapons be compatible with their objective of gaining global superiority and supremacy?

#### **Chinese Premier Cited on Mideast Arms Control**

*LD0807183491 Tehran IRIB Television First Program Network in Persian 1630 GMT 8 Jul 91*

[Excerpts] Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng, who is in Tehran, has described his government's stance regarding relations between Iran and China and international issues. He was speaking at a news conference this afternoon. [passage omitted]

Turning to his country's stance at the Paris conference on nuclear arms control in the Middle East, which will be attended by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, he said: At the conference we will maintain our fundamental stance. For Middle East arms control, all-around and committed principles should be followed. In other words, this policy should not apply to a few countries, but to all countries, and the countries in the region should be at a reasonable level from a military standpoint. If the participating countries take a fair stance at the Paris conference, China will deal with it positively. On the whole, we should tie in arms control with the peace trend. [passage omitted]

#### **ISRAEL**

##### **Foreign Minister on Mideast Arms Sales Control Conference**

*TA0807140091 Tel Aviv 'AL HAMISHMAR in Hebrew 8 Jul 91 p 3*

[Report by Moti Bassok]

[Text] The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are due to meet today and tomorrow in Paris within the framework of the committee on limiting arms

exports to the Middle East. On the eve of the meeting, Israeli Foreign Minister David Levi yesterday reiterated his call for an international conference of all exporters of conventional weapons to the region and of all Middle East countries to discuss practical ways to limit the Middle East arms race.

In a statement released yesterday, Levi said that Israel attaches great importance to ongoing efforts to limit and reduce the quantities of conventional weapons in the Middle East.

Israel was among the first countries to point to the necessity of imposing limitations on the regional arms race, even before the Gulf war, because it believed that the tremendous quantities of weapons in the Middle East could lead to the destabilization of the region and another war.

"The Arab arsenal and its huge dimensions constitute a threat to Israel's very existence," Levi said. The foreign minister noted that Iraq still constitutes a danger and that Syria does not differ essentially from Iraq. "It is very important that the parties convening in Paris consider maintaining Israel's qualitative and military edge a sine qua non to prevent another war in the region, because Israel is the only country in the Middle East threatened by all its neighbors—except Egypt—and by all of them together."

Levi added that the threat to Israel is not only posed by its neighbors but by other countries in the Middle East. Levi concludes his statement: "We are aware of the difficulties involved in discussing arms control measures while the Arab states maintain a state of war with Israel. If the state of war is terminated, however, talks could be initiated."

#### **SAUDI ARABIA**

##### **Support of Ban on Mass Destruction Weapons Noted**

*LD1607202291 Riyadh Saudi Arabian Television Network in Arabic 1830 GMT 16 Jul 91*

[Text] A responsible source has made the following statement to SPA: Based on the firm policy of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which supports the spreading of peace all over the world, for mankind to enjoy peace and its positive effects on the welfare of mankind and on its social and economic development, the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has always supported and continues to support and back any effort to limit the spread of destructive weapons worldwide and in any region of the world. It has always supported and continues to support and back the creation of regions free from these weapons in any part of the globe.

In application of this constructive policy, which stems from its love of peace, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has joined the treaty banning the proliferation of nuclear

weapons and abided by its provisions. It has also supported at various international gatherings the work to limit chemical and bacteriological weapons. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia deeply believes that the Middle East region, which has suffered many wars and has sunk under the burden of the production and importation of the various weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological—is one of the regions of the world in most dire need of being freed of such destructive weapons and of solving its problems by peaceful means, away from wars and destruction.

The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, in line with its policy of supporting peace in any part of the world, wants to express its sincere desire and full readiness to abide by any ban imposed on weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East—once this ban includes “all the states of the region equally—whether at the level of production or importation or at the level of the balance of the military capabilities with regard to quantity and quality

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia also declares its readiness, should the elements of the implementation of such a ban apply to any of the weapons in its possession, to lead the states of the region in getting rid of such banned weapons. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi

Arabia is ready to make a positive and constructive contribution to any search for drawing up an international framework for a system of ban in the region, its principles, and the regulations for its implementation. Proceeding from its serious desire for peace to prevail in the Middle East region and its untiring work for this, a matter which creates trust among the states of the region and leads to the removal of the weapons of mass destruction and the causes of the arms race in the region, the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia affirms anew its support in this context for the initiative of His Excellency U.S. President George Bush aimed at banning the proliferation of mass destruction weapons in the Middle East region, calls on all the states of the region to make a serious response to this noble objective, and asks all the states in the world to urge the states of the region to achieve this objective.

By declaring its support for the U.S. initiative and every initiative that aims at the achievement of this desire, while expressing its sincere desire and full readiness to abide by such a ban, the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia looks forward to the time when the Kingdom will be able to implement it with all the states of the region, so that peace, security, stability and prosperity may prevail in the Middle East region, in the interest of its peoples and the interest of all mankind.

## GENERAL

**Ponomarev Assails U.S., NATO Arms Policies**

91WC0129A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian 11 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by B. Ponomarev, academician: "Defense of Peace and Disarmament"]

[Text] We have commemorated the 50th anniversary of the start of the Great Patriotic War. This date was a powerful reminder of the problems of war and peace in our own time. The broad masses of the people everywhere have greeted with tremendous satisfaction and approval events occurring in the international arena which have led to the end of the "cold war" and to a situation in which nuclear antagonism between two different social systems is becoming a thing of the past.

The principal foundation of these remarkable changes is improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The USSR's foreign policy, based on new thinking, was met with understanding across the ocean and in other states in both West and East. Specific and serious results have already been achieved with regard to arms reduction, including nuclear arms reduction. Medium-range and lesser-range nuclear missiles have been eliminated. Negotiations on strategic missile reductions are underway.

We are also witnessing a major shift in the political realm through the creation of a new concept of international relations which should have no place for a policy of force or dependence upon nuclear arsenals.

However, unfortunately arms proliferation continues. This is primarily true of the NATO countries. Eloquent testimony of this is provided by expenditures for arms and armed forces. In the United States, England and France those expenditures in 1991 remained at virtually the same level as in the preceding five years, a period when a genuine arms race was underway, motivated by the "Soviet military threat." Total U.S. military expenditures for 1992 are planned at \$295.2 billion, i.e. will remain at the "cold war" level.

The U.S. Department of Defense is drawing up plans for military building in the 1990's which emphasize gradual modernization of proven weapons systems and military equipment.

Nor are the other NATO countries and Japan lagging behind. Japan's 1990 military budget was over \$40 billion, surpassing the defense expenditures of Great Britain and France. The percentage of military production in Japan's economy is growing. Its Cabinet of Ministers has approved a new five-year program for a buildup of its forces in the 1991-95 period. There are plans to allocate \$175 billion for this program, or \$33 billion more than in the preceding five-year period.

Special note should be made of nuclear weapons. It is a well-known fact that enough nuclear weapons have been

stockpiled to destroy all of humanity and all life on Earth if they were ever used. Yet nonetheless they continue to be perfected. New types are being tested.

As far back as 1986 the Soviet Union proposed to the United Nations a ban on all nuclear weapons testing, and has on many occasions spoken out in favor of this during talks with the NATO countries. Yet the testing continues. In 1990 and the first five months of this year alone the United States conducted 12 nuclear tests. France and England also continue to carry out test detonations.

Since other states have not given up their testing despite repeated proposals by the Soviet Union to ban such testing the USSR is also conducting a minimal number of tests. In 1990 there was only one underground nuclear test. In the West politicians and military men are saying quite frankly that "nuclear tests will continue to play an important role for the foreseeable future."

At the same time as the Soviet Union is withdrawing its forces from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, by NATO decisions U.S. and British forces are supposed to remain in the territory of the FRG, though in a somewhat reduced form.

In order to justify arming and keeping armed forces in the center of Europe, NATO is once again using the worn-out assertion of a Soviet military threat which it used during the "cold war." In an interview published in the German weekly WELT AM SONNTAG in late May, U.S. Secretary of Defense Cheney stated that "the USSR still presents the greatest threat to European security."

In particular it should be noted that in November 1990 a treaty was signed between the Soviet Union and the FRG "concerning good-neighborly relations and cooperation," which serves the cause of strengthening of peace throughout Europe and, of course, removes the issue of a "Soviet military threat."

However, despite the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and despite the new Soviet-German relations NATO continues to exist and to function, allegedly in order to protect Europe's security. Yet in Paris at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) another means of ensuring that security was outlined and set in motion. That means is the creation of organs and institutions to regulate conflicts and prevent war. This approach envisions meetings between heads of states and governments, convening of a Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs (at least once a year), and establishment of a committee of senior officials to make preparations for the council, implementation of its decisions, drafting of recommendations, establishment of a center to prevent conflicts and to help the council reduce conflicts, and formation of a CSCE Parliamentary Assembly comprised of members of all the member states' parliaments. A recent meeting of ministers of foreign affairs from European countries which participate in the CSCE made significant progress in this direction.

Nevertheless, North Atlantic circles are in no hurry to take that path. A session of the NATO Council held in June 1991 simply avoided the arms reduction issue, even though quite a few general statements on security were made there.

NATO documents and speeches by its leaders continue to refer to the USSR's great military potential. Yet no reference is made to the fact that, firstly, the Soviet leadership has proposed a principle of "reasonable defensive ability" or that, secondly, it has proposed many times in the past and continues to propose reductions in all countries' military potential, arms reduction, including nuclear arms reduction, and a ban on nuclear testing.

A new comprehensive concept for moving toward a nuclear weapons-free world has been developed on the basis of the principles of new political thinking which exist in the Soviet Union and an understanding of the world community's priorities. This concept for the creation of an all-encompassing system of international security was outlined at the 28th CPSU Congress. At the heart of this concept are efforts to ensure the survival of humanity. It includes not only military-political aspects, but economic, ecological and humanitarian aspects as well.

The program for nuclear disarmament set forth in a communique issued by M. S. Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 has also been developed and presented to the world community.

It must be noted that realistically-thinking high-level government officials are also talking about the need for arms reduction. For example, G. Andreotti, Italy's prime minister, recently declared: "We express the hope that a favorable climate will be reestablished with regard to efforts toward further arms reduction, efforts which laid the groundwork for ending the 'cold war'."

Much attention has been attracted by Francois Mitterrand's arms reduction plan. While affirming the general position that it is essential to ban bacteriological weapons and destroy chemical weapons, the French president has also proposed a number of other measures in the realm of security and disarmament.

For his part President George Bush has called on Israel and all the Arab states to ban the production or acquisition of materials for nuclear weapons and the proliferation of such weapons in their region. What the response of those countries will be is as yet unknown. Thus far the region continues to become ever more saturated with all types of arms.

Instances of arms proliferation which hamper disarmament processes cannot fail to cause justified alarm among the masses of the people, those who would be the first to suffer from rising military expenditures. "Militarism is one of the greatest dangers which threaten the freedom and rights of every human being," warns the General Conference of Labor, which has over 15 million

workers, primarily Christians, as members. The most important task facing every human being and the world community is in the Conference's opinion efforts to "put an end to the arms race."

Largely similar demands have been put forward by such a major workers' organization as the International Conference of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). On behalf of 90 million workers it is insisting on substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons and is demanding a complete ban on nuclear testing.

The World Trade Union Federation, in turn, feels that its priority task is to step up antiwar activism. The 12th World Trade Union Congress, held on 13-20 November 1990 in Moscow, emphasized the huge damage done to the world economy by military expenditures. During its consideration of military-to-civilian conversion the congress noted that the beginning of practical disarmament will cast this issue in a new light. The complexity and scale of conversion processes will increase. They "will require appropriate planning and preparation, as well as the development of practical conversion programs containing measures aimed at preserving jobs, maintaining workers' standard of living, arranging retraining when necessary and ensuring economic efficiency."

The programmatic documents adopted by the 18th Congress of the Socialist International as well as contacts with social-democratic and socialist parties and trade unions of various orientations indicate the possibility of arriving at a common view of the modern world and a largely common understanding of our tasks. Transformation of this possibility into a reality would be a major landmark in the cause of disarmament. We all have a major stake in increasing the role of the working class in social processes and in using its tremendous potential in the transformations which are taking place in our country and around the world on the basis of humanistic and democratic values.

On behalf of the 486 international, regional, national and local organizations it represents the 12th World Trade Union Congress put forward "a trade union alternative" to the present situation in the realm of disarmament, a situation which the congress found unsatisfactory.

What does the mass workers' movement propose as a "trade union alternative"? "Being guided by the goal of entering the next millennium without wars and violence." In order to accomplish this it will be necessary to encourage "development of new political thinking in international relations" and achieve "real influence by workers and the world public on the disarmament process in order to ensure "substantial progress along the path toward radical reduction in and consistent elimination of nuclear missiles, chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, substantial conventional arms and armed forces reduction and a ban on the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction."

The "trade union alternative" devotes considerable attention to the struggle to create an economy of international cooperation in place of the "economy of armaments." It insists on "simultaneous dissolution" of military blocs and a ban on the creation of new blocs which could lead to heightened international tension.

Much work on behalf of disarmament is being done by Soviet public organizations: trade unions, friendship societies, peace committees, women's organizations, youth organizations and other organizations. In June the Soviet Union was the scene of an international meeting sponsored by the Soviet Peace Fund and a U.N. department under the motto: "Into the 21st Century Under Conditions of Lasting Peace."

All this activity attests to the fact that anyone who does not want to fall victim to the inferno of nuclear war is being called upon to step up the struggle to halt the arms race and bring about decisive reductions in armed forces and ban nuclear testing. It is a well-known fact that today the world possesses more weapons than have ever existed in the history of humanity. Expanding weapons even further would be to strike a blow at the very existence of society. And in our opinion a major role should be played by the workers' movement acting in concert with other peace movements. It is precisely the working class in league with those movements which can achieve adoption of new major decisions in the field of arms reduction and then achieve practical realization of those decisions and demand full implementation of the decision set forth in the Paris Charter.

In view of the vital importance to all humanity of stopping the production of weapons and allocation of colossal sums to military expenditures, it would be appropriate to hold a special U.N. session which would not be limited just to words, but which would also approve more realistic plans for stopping the production of weapons or their modernization.

#### Reports on Paris Perm-5 Meeting on Arms Sales Controls

##### Churkin Comments

LD0807151691 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 8 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, July 8 (TASS)—The Soviet Union intends to take an active part in the first meeting of experts delegated by the five U.N. Security Council permanent member-countries [Perm-5] to Paris to discuss restrictions on arms sales and their non-proliferation, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaly Churkin told a news conference here today.

According to Churkin, the USSR believes that a way to solve the problem of restricting arms supplies can be found only on the basis of joint efforts by states, by

ensuring the balance of their interests, observing the principle of security of the sides and transferring from excessive armaments to the sensible defence sufficiency, as well as consolidating global security and stability and eradicating the sources of regional tensions.

Churkin noted that the Soviet Union proceeds from the expectation that the first meeting of experts from five countries will be constructive in nature and enable the world community to lay a sound basis for further steps towards restricting international arms sales, as well as to gain a better understanding of approaches to non-proliferation problems.

##### Commentator Views Issue

LD0807213191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 8 JUL 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] In Paris experts of the five permanent United Nations Security Council member nations are discussing on Monday and Tuesday the problem of limiting arms sales to countries of the Middle East. Will the arms exports be reduced? Our commentator Yuriy Solton's opinion.

For the first time since 1945 representatives of Great Britain, China, the USSR, the United States, and France have gathered to work out rules of this quite profitable trade. Their share in the arms supplies to the Middle East has been 85 percent in the past few years, and not only with modern arms but also with technologies that enable the recipient countries to manufacture themselves nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons. Israel and Iraq have made the fastest progress in this area.

The Persian Gulf war, during which Iraq threatened to use weapons of mass annihilation, has shown how dangerous it is to arm regimes that have plans for expansion. Strong calls have been made about a need for strict international control over arms exports, and there's been more than calls. The Soviet Union has proposed putting up a barrier to the spreading of weapons of mass annihilation in the region. Moscow believes it is necessary to have a balanced reduction in the supplies there of all arms, first of all of missiles and launchers. President Bush has urged the main arms exporters to collective self-restraint. He offered setting up international control over arms sales by exchanging appropriate information, but he made a reservation at once by stressing that his country would keep supporting the legal right of every state to self-defense. Analysts find this means that Washington reserves the right of uncontrolled sales of arms to those countries it chooses itself. Israel is meant above all, which a few days ago asked the United States to increase military aid to it by 40 percent.

What is the position of the other big powers? France advocates the extension to all regions of the world of the new rules about the spreading of arms. It also wants the

limitations to affect civilian technologies that can be used for arms production. Britain believes a responsible approach must be made so as not to harm the lawful interests of the British arms exporters. China put forward a plan of limitation that would cover all the countries and all types of weapons, stressing the fact that the disproportions in the amount of arms in different Middle Eastern countries create a serious threat to peace.

As we can see, the stand of the five main arms exporters largely coincide, but they are also different on many points. One can hope that common sense will take the upper hand, both over the desire to maintain the growing profits from arms sales and over political calculation. Of course, it would be naive to think that the arms sales will be greatly reduced in the foreseeable future, but it is necessary to have strict international control, possibly under United Nations auspices. It is important that precisely the five permanent UN Security Council members have started talks on working out the mechanism for this control.

#### PRAVDA Report

PM1107120591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 91  
Second Edition p 4

[Report by unidentified correspondent: "Big Five" Draw Up Rules"]

[Text] Paris, 10 July—A two-day conference of representatives of the USSR, the United States, France, Britain, and China on problems of the export of conventional arms and the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction has been held here. The "big five" occupy the leading place in the world in terms of weapons exports, and among them the Soviet Union now holds first place.

The participants in the meeting agreed to draw up international rules for the export of weapons, primarily to explosive spots like the Near East. At the conference, proposals were submitted from France according to which it is recommended that deliveries of weapons of mass destruction to this region be refrained from and that a total ban be imposed on deliveries of chemical weapons and on any aid to other countries from the "big five" in developing them.

The communique adopted on the results of the meeting points out that its participants note with anxiety the danger connected with the excessive buildup of military potentials in various regions. The representatives of the five states, which are permanent members of the UN Security Council, confirmed that they will not sell weapons to other countries if such deliveries could jeopardize international stability. The sides also voiced their intention "to observe the rule of restraint" when making decisions on questions of weapons exports.

It was decided to continue consultations on the problems discussed. It was agreed that a new meeting of representatives of the five states which are permanent members

of the UN Security Council devoted to this subject will be held in London in October this year.

#### Soviet Delegation Chief Comments

LD1007151191 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT  
10 Jul 91

[By Sergey Batyrev]

[Text] Paris, July 10 (TASS)—Problems of conventional armaments export and nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction were discussed by a two-day meeting of representatives of the United States, USSR, Great Britain, France, and China, that ended here on Tuesday evening. It was the first such meeting in the postwar history.

The communique adopted on the results of the meeting says its participants are concerned over inordinate buildup of military potentials in various regions.

Representatives of the five countries, permanent members of the UN Security Council, confirmed that they will not sell arms to other countries if such deliveries can jeopardise international stability.

Emphasising the danger inherent in the spread of weapons of mass destruction, they agreed to work out specific measures for arms control and nonproliferation on a world and regional scale.

It was noted in this connection that a genuine answer to the menace of spreading weapons of mass destruction is the conclusion of verifiable agreements on arms control and disarmament.

The sides also firmly declared in support of the idea of creating in the Middle East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction.

As to the export of conventional armaments, the five members of the UN Security Council declared, first of all, for greater responsibility, greater confidence and greater openness in the area. The sides also expressed the intention to observe restraint in making decisions on arms export.

It has been decided to continue consultations on problems discussed. It was agreed that a new meeting of representatives of the five permanent members of UN Security Council on this subject will be held in London in October.

Disarmament problems play an important role in changes in world politics in the recent period, and this is one of the main reasons why the meeting was held, head of the USSR delegation, Ambassador Konstantin Mikhailov told TASS.

"We are all striving to achieve greater security, harmoniously combining its political and military aspects," he said. "Meanwhile, questions of arms delivery and sales have not been discussed at international talks over a long

time. The situation in the world is different now, and the Gulf crisis gave an impetus to holding these talks here at present."

Appropriate initiatives of U.S. President George Bush and French President Francois Mitterrand were advanced following the Gulf crisis. British Prime Minister John Major expressed the ideas approaching these initiatives. The Soviet side made suggestions in this direction.

The initiative for the meeting was made by France. It should be noted that all permanent members of the UN Security Council expressed the readiness to discuss these problems.

It is apparent that inordinate, uncontrolled, armed deliveries that are not balanced militarily and politically lead to destabilisation in some or other region.

During the meeting in Paris it was discussed how to work further to find a solution that would consider security of all people, ensure the lowest level in armaments, and restrict and prohibit the deliveries of weapons of mass destruction, missiles and rocketry equipment. Finally, it should be remembered that a rational solution to the problem of arms exports will promote the solution of numerous socio-economic problems.

Openness regarding arms supplies and sales should be the basis of the approach to these matters, Mikhailov said. There were specific proposals on these matters. For instance, there was an idea to look for some forms of mutual notification of arms supplies. There is an understanding that the sides should exercise restraint in arms supplies. However, the solution to this problem cannot be unilateral: Both arms exporters and importers should participate since an arms market, like any other, is based on supply and demand.

### Meeting Called 'Unprecedented'

*LD1107203691 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT  
11 Jul 91*

[By TASS analyst Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, July 11 (TASS)—A meeting of representatives of five states—permanent members of the United Nations Security Council—on arms export standards ended in Paris on Tuesday.

This unprecedented event was, undoubtedly, a direct result of an acute crisis that erupted early last August in the Gulf after Iraq occupied Kuwait. In fact, the aggressor had been armed by many countries.

The five states, whose representatives gathered in Paris, account for 80 per cent of all weapons in the Iraqi Army.

In the past twenty years, the Middle and Near East has been turned into a powder keg with a burning fuse.

According to the Stockholm Institute for Peace Research the Soviet Union and the United States accounted for 69

per cent of arms sales, 40 and 29 per cent respectively, in 1990. Soviet exports have fallen considerably since then. EC countries accounted for 21 per cent. Most weapons were sold to the Middle and Near East.

In the post war period, requests for new modern weapons have been flowing in to Western states from "traditional" clients and Israel, which, according to the International Monetary Fund, spent a quarter of its gross national product on arms from 1972 to 1988.

The Paris meeting discussed two disarmament plans. The U.S. proposal envisages a freeze on deployment and a subsequent ban on ballistic missiles, chemical arms, the production of nuclear materials and cuts in conventional arms sales in the Middle East.

The French suggestion was more radical and suggested eliminating chemical arsenals, banning chemical weapons production, reducing nuclear weapons stocks and holding talks to balance forces in all regions of the world. Paris also suggested creating a register of weapons sales at the United Nations.

Participants in the meeting reached a superficial compromise between the two plans, deciding to discuss "disarmament in the Middle Eastern region in a global aspect" behind closed doors.

The "five" supported ridding the Middle and Near East from weapons of mass destructions and agreed in principle not to forward arms to countries that threaten regional stability and step up national control over such exports.

Practically all participants in the Paris meeting expressed satisfaction with its results.

The meeting's decision might appear declarative. However, immense difficulties that faced participants should be taken into account. Some regarded several Middle Eastern states as "terrorists", others—as "fighters for national liberation".

Apparently, the sides reached consensus that any state in the region has the right to purchase weapons for self-defence.

Control over weapons deliveries is especially important, because private companies, seeking profit, repeatedly violated this provision. Besides, any weapons delivery can violate the delicate balance of forces and prompt demands to restore "justice".

The implementation of concrete decisions requires a sober and pragmatic approach from all sides.

In the run up to the Paris meeting, participants stressed that it is a starting point "in a long, complex and delicate process". Representatives of the five powers will have their next meeting in London in October.

**USSR Said To Influence Outcome**

*OW1507114491 Moscow INTERFAX in English  
1200 GMT 12 Jul 91*

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Proposals tabled by the USSR had a significant bearing on the results of this week's meeting of the five permanent UN Security Council members in Paris, called to discuss the question of implementing controls on arms trading. These latest proposals follow on from recent moves by Moscow to limit its own arms exports.

A military specialist from the Soviet Foreign Ministry pointed out that, as early as 1985, in his response to the Rome Club, President Gorbachev had backed measures to place restrictions on military exports. In 1988, a UN resolution called for an investigation into the possibility of making all arms deals subject to open scrutiny.

On August 14 last year, the then Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze sent a letter to the UN Secretary General outlining Soviet proposals for limiting arms deals. These proposals included the setting up of a UN register which would record all arms transactions. The Foreign Ministry specialist says that the USSR stands firmly behind these proposals today when, in the light of the Gulf War, the question of arms trading has become more urgent than ever.

**'Important Landmark'**

*PM1607092191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91  
Second Edition p 4*

[By Vsevolod Ovchinnikov under the "My Opinion" rubric: "To Prevent Pseudo-Conversion"]

[Text] In Paris recently the five permanent members of the UN Security Council—the USSR, the United States, Britain, France, and China—discussed the question of how to regulate the arms trade and, above all, to prevent the spread of means of mass destruction, particularly to such dangerously explosive regions as the Near East.

The bitter paradox is that the five aforementioned great powers, which bear the chief responsibility under the UN Charter for maintaining international peace, head the list of the major exporters of combat hardware. In particular, they were the chief suppliers of the weapons with which Iraq seized Kuwait last summer.

The military conflagration by the oil wells of the Persian Gulf reminded mankind that East-West detente can lead to dangerous "pseudo-conversion," i.e. the transfer of combat hardware from the North to the South whereby weapons which have become unnecessary in the European theater of military confrontation make their way to developing countries in a mighty flood.

The Paris conference was a major step toward creating a generally accepted "code of conduct" in the international arms trade. The meeting participants declared in

the communique that they will not transfer conventional arms to anyone if the excessive buildup of military potentials will have a destabilizing impact. They also noted the threat to peace and stability associated with the proliferation of nuclear arms, chemical and biological weapons, and missiles and began formulating fair, reasonable, all-embracing, balanced, and specific measures to control them on both a global and a regional scale.

This concerns, above all, the creation of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Near East. To realize this, it is proposed to eliminate "surface-to-surface" missiles from that area, not to produce or import components of nuclear warheads, to place all nuclear reactors under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to oblige the states of the region to accede to the convention banning chemical weapons.

I regard as an important result of the Paris meeting the accord among the "big five" to set up under the UN secretary general's auspices a register of interstate deals to export and import combat hardware which would be drawn up on an absolutely objective basis. The Soviet Union has long been campaigning for just such glasnost in the world arms trade.

It is clear from the communique adopted in Paris that the five permanent members of the UN Security Council intend to meet again in London in order to continue this meeting in October. They declared that the transfer of weapons and military technology regardless of specific conditions promotes instability in some regions, and they acknowledged their special responsibility for measures which must eliminate such a risk.

This undoubtedly concerns means of mass destruction above all. The Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed in 1968 on the initiative of the USSR, the United States, and Britain, played a considerable role in curbing the arms race at its most dangerous time. More than 140 states have acceded to the treaty. This summer the Republic of South Africa was added to the list. The PRC recently declared its intention to accede to the Nonproliferation Treaty in the very near future.

As regards ballistic missiles and the technology of their production, the seven (the United States, Japan, Germany, Britain, France, Italy, and Canada) decided in 1987 to limit the sale of such weapons to other states. It is gratifying that the Soviet Union and China also became parties to the accords on this question in Paris for the first time.

Experience has shown that deliveries of conventional combat hardware can also pose a threat to international stability. It is a pity that the Soviet-U.S. talks on the arms trade were broken off at the time of the exacerbation of the "cold war" in the late seventies. PRAVDA has already written that maybe the time has now come to set up something like the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls, but not in order to conceal from the East the scientific and technical achievements

of the West but to prevent the arms race from shifting from the North to the South, from developed countries to developing ones.

The Paris meeting of the "big five" was an important landmark on the way to placing the arms trade within a sensible, secure framework while preserving every state's legitimate right to defend itself and consequently to acquire the means necessary for this, and to prevent "pseudoconversion," i.e. the shifting of military confrontation from one plane to another.

## START TALKS

### Reports, Commentary on Washington Talks

#### Moiseyev Comments on Outlook

*LD1007144291 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1217 GMT 10 Jul 91*

[By correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 10 July—"In response to Saturday's message from U.S. President George Bush, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has decided to send USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and me to Washington in order finally to deal with all outstanding issues in time for the upcoming meeting between the two leaders of our countries," stated Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, in an interview with a TASS correspondent before flying off to the United States today.

General Moiseyev recalled that the leaderships of the Soviet Union and the United States have expressed a readiness to hold the next Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow at the end of July-beginning of August 1991. "During this meeting there are plans to sign a treaty on reducing and limiting strategic offensive weapons," stressed Mikhail Moiseyev. He added that work on preparing this treaty has been going on for a long time. "All that remains is to agree on a few issues, and the elaboration of the draft treaty will be complete," noted the chief of the general staff.

In setting off for the United States, said Mikhail Moiseyev, the Soviet delegation is acting on the basis that all the final few remaining issues will in the end be resolved if the sides move to meet each other. "This is necessary in order to ensure that in the very near future the Soviet and U.S. delegations at the strategic offensive weapons talks in Geneva can complete the technical formulation of the draft treaty so that it may be signed by the presidents of our two states," noted General Moiseyev in conclusion.

#### Bessmertnykh Arrival Statement in Washington

*LD1107042691 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 2352 GMT 10 Jul 91*

[By correspondents Igor Barsukov and Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington [dateline as received]—USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh arrived in the U.S capital on Wednesday for a working meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. The visit is taking place in the framework of an agreement between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush.

The main object of the talks, which will be held on 11-12 July, will be to solve the outstanding problems which are an obstacle to signing a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms.

The Soviet minister is accompanied by Marshal Moiseyev, the first deputy defense minister and chief of general staff of the USSR armed forces, and Aleksey Obukhov, USSR deputy foreign minister.

At Andrews air force base near Washington, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and those accompanying him were welcomed by representatives of the U.S. State Department and other officials.

Among the welcoming party were Viktor Komplektov, USSR ambassador to the United States, and Yuliy Vorontsev, permanent Soviet representative at the United Nations.

In a brief statement for the press, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said:

I shall be taking part in what in my opinion will be one of the most important rounds of the talks. They will be devoted to completing work on the strategic offensive arms treaty. I hope we shall achieve progress. I expect we shall also discuss the other issues on the agenda of Soviet-American relations which we usually examine, including bilateral contacts and regional problems. In particular, I hope the secretary of state and I will give some time to the problems of the Middle East, which demand considerable attention.

So this is an important visit. With me are Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, USSR Deputy Defense Minister Aleksey Obukhov, and a group of experienced arms control experts who will be taking part in the discussion of ABM issues. I hope our talks will be productive.

#### White House Talks Start

*LD1107115691 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1137 GMT 11 Jul 91*

[By correspondents Igor Barsukov and Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington, 11 July (TASS)—A meeting between U.S. President George Bush and USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who is here on a working visit, has just begun at the White House. Problems of the completion of the work on the START treaty, prospects for holding a Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow, and questions of bilateral relations are being discussed during the course of the conversation. Mikhail Moiseyev, USSR first deputy minister of defense and chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and Viktor Kompletkov, USSR ambassador to the United States, are present at the meeting.

**Bessmertnykh 'Very Satisfied' With Outcome**

*LD1407233591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2225 GMT 14 Jul 91*

[By TASS correspondents Igor Barsukov, Aleksey Berezhkov, and Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington, 15 July (TASS)—Talks between USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker ended here on Sunday. The intensive discussions, which have been continuing since Thursday, were devoted in the main to resolving problems hampering the achievement of a Soviet-American agreement on reducing strategic offensive armaments.

"I would say that we have achieved enormous success in moving the strategic offensive armaments treaty forward toward a conclusion," stressed James Baker in a short statement for the press on the ending of the talks. We have managed to resolve nearly all the main problems that remained when Minister Bessmertnykh arrived in Washington.

Effectively, all questions except one have been resolved. This is a very technical question and our experts will continue to work on it.

Replying to a question about a Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow, the secretary of state noted that he "does not have authority to predict such things, and it is best to ask Presidents Bush and Gorbachev about this when they meet in London on Wednesday."

"This is an enormous step forward on the road to the conclusion of a treaty on strategic offensive armaments. The long road to an agreement—nine years long—is indeed coming to an end," Aleksandr Bessmertnykh told journalists in his turn.

"I am very satisfied with the work we have done together with the American delegation headed by the secretary of state," he said. "We have managed to resolve the most complex problems that remained on the talks agenda." The Soviet minister expressed the hope that the sides will be able to consider and resolve "in the very near future" the question that remains without agreement.

**Compromise Reported**

*LD1507070891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0236 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[Excerpts] Washington, 15 Jul (TASS)—[passage omitted] A.A. Bessmertnykh pointed out that success had become possible thanks to the willingness of the parties "to meet each other half way in an attempt to find a common denominator for necessary solutions." He said that on one issue in particular, possibly, the Soviet Union had made a greater concession. On another the United States had done the same. "This has been an enormous job, done with a mutual desire to reach a compromise," he emphasized.

The Soviet minister expressed the hope that the parties will be able to consider and resolve "in the near future" the question that remains without agreement.

**Compromises on Technical Issues**

*PM1507190591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Report by correspondents A. Blinov and V. Nadein: "Success in Washington"]

[Excerpt] Washington—Literally half an hour before the end of these talks, an official declared: failure. The delegations, CNN television news said, are parting with nothing. And that was not hard to believe. Ongoing reports from the three-day meeting were not reassuring. But then Soviet Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker came out to the journalists thronging the State Department foyer. And the word that came not from the sidelines, but from the delegation heads themselves, was: success. Or, as the secretary of state put it, "outstanding progress."

The Soviet Union and the United States have been discussing the treaty on strategic offensive arms limitation and reduction for nine years. This treaty is vast and unparalleled, as are the weapons it is designed to cut. For a year now it has appeared that only purely technical details remained. But since, in nuclear weapons, every nut and bolt implies death for millions of people, the final agreement was receding all the time, like the horizon as you approach it.

Even now the final line has not been drawn. The sides did not have quite enough time. How much more time did they need? Two hours? Two weeks? The perfidious nature of the subject is such that no one knows. But it is definitely known that, first, out of the many differences, one remains. And, second, that it is soluble.

But, as J. Baker stressed in summing up the results of the meeting, all the interim successes are important only as a way of keeping account internally of the work done. A treaty is possible only as a package of solutions. All the other accords in the 1,000-page text are worth nothing until an answer to that final problem is agreed and accepted by both sides.

However, as A.A. Bessmertnykh put it, what remains unresolved "is not even a problem, but a single aspect of a single problem."

At the end of last week, when President G. Bush put to President M.S. Gorbachev a pressing request to send a delegation with wide powers to Washington urgently, he himself assessed the treaty as "96-percent" ready. Out of all the interwoven problems, there remained on the table three hard nuts on which several expert teams had already blunted their teeth. In the jargon of the participants in the talks, they were designated as "downloading," "telemetry," and "throwweight."

This "downloading," or, to put it more accurately, "lowering of the number of countable warheads on missiles with multiple reentry vehicles," was described by A.A. Bessmertnykh, head of the Soviet delegation, as "the main task on which we were working here and which we were trying to resolve first and foremost." The task was fully resolved.

"Telemetry," or the entire range of questions relating to obtaining, deciphering, and using data from missile launches, was described by Bessmertnykh as the "press favorite." Probably because the press has rightly regarded the telemetry problem first and foremost as a touchstone, an indicator of openness. An indication of how far the sides—and first and foremost the military in the two countries—are prepared to show their hands.

After the talks, when Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, slightly tired with success, were talking unconstrainedly with a group of Soviet journalists, the minister said:

"The talks have lasted nine years, and all that time telemetry was discussed as if it was something absolutely impossible. People thought this problem was impossible to solve. And telemetry covers a multitude of different aspects. We had to sweat over it."

The general lifted the curtain a fraction:

"Old missiles, new missiles... Telemetry from the missile, telemetry from the warhead... In the boost phase, in the free-flight phase... The Americans have been waiting for this moment for 35 years, in order to obtain at least some material about our missiles... For us too, the material we will have access to is of great interest. In short, we decided that we will exchange magnetic tapes."

In the course of the talks that have ended, the sides reached an accord of fundamental importance on the subject of what is to be considered a new missile and what is a modification not classified as a cardinal improvement of strategic weapons. After lengthy maneuvers, agreement was reached: A missile with a throwweight exceeding its predecessor's by 21 percent or more is deemed to be a new missile.

But how can these percentages be measured? The future military-strategic programs of the Soviet Union and the

United States will depend on the answer to this question, A.A. Bessmertnykh said. And he went on to say: "We must be very careful and very attentive in this respect. Because lurking behind every figure and every indicator are the most complex problems of the building of the Soviet Union's strategic Armed Forces."

The chief of the General Staff stressed that in his firm conviction, the treaty "will fully ensure the security of our national borders." And since M.A. Moiseyev made a special request to journalists who participated in the conversation, we will cite his whole answer to the question of how he assesses cooperation between servicemen and civilians within our delegation.

The general said: "I want to get rid of this old issue altogether. It remains from the time of my predecessor (the present foreign minister). When accusations were being made that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is working in one key and the Ministry of Defense in another. So you must let all the readers and the general public know that there we have no differences. Let me say that today I was filled with admiration for Aleksandr Aleksandrovich's stance, both as a man and as a citizen."

The heads of the delegations embarked on their European journey late Sunday evening and not midday Saturday, as had been previously planned. J. Baker—to London, to the G-7 meeting. A.A. Bessmertnykh to Moscow, to report to the USSR president.

But the experts' work on the last "hard nut"—as it turned out—was not suspended even for a day. Furthermore, as M.A. Moiseyev said, there remained "a night, a day, and a night until M.S. Gorbachev's departure to London, which is equal to three whole days for a military man." The leaders of our delegation, as indeed the Americans, are not excluding the possibility that by Wednesday—when the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush is scheduled to take place—it will be stated that the last difference of opinion no longer exists in the text of the unparalleled treaty.

This will remove the last of the obstacles to a Moscow meeting. However, the heads of both the Soviet and U.S. foreign policy departments stressed that the two presidents would take the definitive decision, and their London "half-meeting," as A.A. Bessmertnykh called it, would predetermine the dimensions and substance of the summit.

The Soviet minister noted that it would be impossible to overcome the last remaining problems without the sincere desire of both sides to reach accord. In his opinion, this results from a general desire on the part of the White House "within the framework of its possibilities and concepts to assist (the Soviet Union), particularly as regards the transition of our economy to a market economy." [passage omitted]

**TASS Correspondents Review Talks**

*LD1507112191 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 0923 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[By correspondents Igor Barsukov, Aleksey Berezhkov, Aleksandr Korolev]

[Excerpt] Washington, 15 July, (TASS)—I do not recall a round of talks when so much was done in such a short period of time, USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said in an interview with Soviet journalists after the completion of his talks with United States Secretary of State J. Baker on Sunday. He was summing up the results of the intensive discussions which had taken place in the American capital, aimed at completing work on the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. The minister also gave an appraisal of the current state and prospects for Soviet-American relations.

A.A. Bessmertnykh stressed that the treaty on strategic offensive weapons was "the most phenomenal document ever drawn up in history". I am not speaking about volume. It is such a fantastically complicated penetration to the heart of strategic balances and technologies that I do not exclude that it might be the first and last treaty of such a kind, the minister said.

The main problem with which we struggled was the reduction in the number of ballistic missile warheads taken into consideration, A.A. Bessmertnykh continued. This occupied the brains of the experts in our delegations for quite a long time, and it was at last successfully and fully resolved here, taking into account mutual interests and the guaranteeing of the Soviet Union's national security. The very difficult problem, the favorite of the press, concerns telemetry, that is the encryption of technical information coming from missiles during trial launches, and it was also overcome. The cardinal problem with bombers was resolved as well. Unfortunately one of the small "sticking points" in the talks prevented us from finally reaching agreement. This was the definition of new types of missiles and, in particular, one of the aspects of the problem—the calculation of their throw-weight.

But I think we can quite justifiably say that these were successful negotiations, emphasized the minister. The discussions about the strategic offensive weapons have been going on for 9 years, and all the time we have been talking about telemetry. This problem was not solved in Geneva or in Washington, or in Moscow. And now the time has come when we had to decide. And everything came together. Each side gets absolutely identical possibilities. But I shall be frank, we did do some sweating over telemetry. This issue was terribly complex. Just as, incidentally, was the problem of reducing the number of warheads and the missile throw-weight. These are such fundamental questions which will probably also predetermine many aspects of future negotiations.

One of the sources of success of the work done, he noted, consists in the fact that we brought a strong team here. The delegation includes members of the main agencies which determine our military policy and the strategic line in military organizational development and industry. They are experts of the highest calibre. Indeed many decisions were made here on the spot, within the powers given to us by the president, which enabled us to solve in 3 days problems which had been sitting on the negotiating table for months and perhaps even years. Take the following detail of the negotiations: We have never before had creative elaborations going on like this, one wave after another. It seems to me that the Americans were astounded to some extent. On some issues it seemed as if we had ten levels of reserve positions. I have participated in negotiations many times, but in terms of pressure and intensity this round was unique. We ran a little short of time but we shall be trying to complete the work on the treaty in the very immediate future. What remains to be solved is not even a problem but one aspect of a problem. If we do some proper work on resolving this technical detail then, working day and night, the work could be completed by the end of the month.

[Words indistinct] What is your assessment of the interaction between the military and non-military representatives within our delegation? This question was addressed to M.A. Moiseyev, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR and Chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, who took part in the conversation.

Generally speaking, I would like to drop this issue. It has been around for a long time. The accusation is made against us to the effect that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is working in one key, as it were, and the Ministry of Defense in another. I want to say: We have no disagreements. I was delighted by Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh's stance as a citizen, and as a patriot, standing up for the national interests of our state.

Do you believe that the planned treaty is equal from the point of view of our national security?

We have done everything possible, replied M.A. Moiseyev, and the document we sign will ensure the security of our national interests.

Continuing the conversation, A.A. Bessmertnykh gave an assessment of Soviet-American relations. Now I can forecast the attitude of the American leadership to ties between the United States and USSR, above all on the basis of the talks which have taken place. This was a very significant round and using the Americans' behavior as a premise, one can predict their next steps at least for the immediate future. On the whole, there is an overall impression that the United States Administration favors, first and foremost, concluding a treaty on strategic offensive weapons and this was evident in everything. But also evident was the pressure which it is

experiencing from circles that are in no particular hurry with this agreement or who even do not wish it to be signed at all. This was sometimes very apparent when there was suddenly some small movement and the representatives of certain circles very quickly moved in on it.

Second, I think the American leadership—President Bush and Secretary of State Baker—is interested in holding a summit. What will now take place in London is, if one may so express it, a half-summit, and it will in some measure determine the scale and content of the coming meeting in Moscow.

Third, the American side has been fairly frank, not just in the corridors, but also at the conference table and in conversation, in stressing that United States leadership has an interest in the progress of our reform and intends, within its capabilities and concepts, to promote it, especially the transition of our economy to a market basis. At the same time, I have not yet had any sense as to what specific form this is going to take. Especially since we are not taking the line that we are dependent on them and are asking for American aid. If they understand that this is in the interests of the United States, then their help will be welcomed. In the next few days the administration will send to Congress the Soviet-American trade agreement. The American side has been interested to know how we are solving the problems of intellectual property, since, as you remember, the agreement itself provides for negotiations on this and the achievement of some movement in this regard. Let me say plainly that as far as the government is concerned, it has proposed appropriate legislation to the Supreme Soviet, but the Supreme Soviet itself has split this problem. It has taken some things from the government program, while leaving the rest up to the Union republics. I told Baker that our government will do everything possible to solve this problem, including efforts in the context associated with joining the Berne convention on copyrights. [passage omitted]

#### **'Good Chance' for Jul Treaty Completion**

*LD1507141191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service  
in English 1210 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton on the Washington talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker]

[Text] The talks were difficult—instead of the scheduled two days, they went on for four days—but it has to be admitted that the task before the two leaders was very complex. Within a few days they had to find solutions to problems that experts had failed to resolve within several months and even during several years.

The two ministers and their aides have coped with this task in general. State Secretary Baker said great success had been made in advancing to complete the START treaty, and in the opinion of Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh a great stride had been taken toward concluding the

treaty on strategic offensive missiles. Talking to reporters he added that the long path to the accord which has taken more than nine years is actually coming to an end.

Indeed, differences have been removed in Washington on such complicated issues as lowering the countable number of warheads as well as access to telemetric data in test launches of missiles. The only remaining obstacle to a treaty is an aspect related to the definition of a new type of ballistic missile. So what's the hitch?

When (the) reporters asked the two ministers to elaborate, they refused to do so due to the technical complexity of the problem. But roughly speaking, the idea is this: that changes are needed in the throw-weight, that is, the ability to carry a greater power of the nuclear charge or a larger number of warheads in order to regard the missile as one of the new type. The treaty permits such missiles, but it is important to have a clear definition of their characteristics in order to rule out the possibility of deception in counting how many and what type of missiles each side may have.

Mr. Baker declared that an accord had been reached: A new missile will be regarded as such if its throw-weight has been increased by 21 percent.

So what remains unresolved? Neither Mr. Baker nor Mr. Bessmertnykh wished to say anything on that matter. But experts assume that issues are yet to be solved about defining the parameters either by the length of a missile or by its range.

On Monday specialists continue to work in Washington. It is possible the conclusion of the agreement will be at the working meeting between President Gorbachev and President Bush in London on Wednesday. Anyway, there is a good chance that the treaty will be ready, if not for signing then, in principle for signing this month. That means that the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow can well be held at the end of this month or early in August.

#### **Bessmertnykh, Moiseyev Comment**

*LD1507202291 Moscow Central Television First  
Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by B. Kalyagin]

[Text] Talks have ended in Washington between the USSR Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh, and U.S. Secretary of State Baker. They were devoted mainly to tackling problems which are hampering the attainment of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons. [Video shows Kalyagin then Soviet-U.S. delegations seated at negotiating table; then Baker standing next to Bessmertnykh addressing journalists, then Bessmertnykh being interviewed by correspondent; he is seated next to Army General Moiseyev, chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces]

The talks marathon went on in Washington for four instead of the planned two days. The Soviet and U.S. delegations, led by Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker all but succeeded in completing a treaty on strategic offensive weapons.

[Begin recording] [Bessmertnykh] The main problem which we have been thrashing out here, and the task which we set ourselves first and foremost to solve, was the problem of reducing ballistic missile warheads. This problem occupied the minds of our delegations for a pretty long time. We finally succeeded in completely resolving this problem on the basis of mutual interests and ensuring the USSR's national security.

Another very difficult problem—a favourite with the press—was also resolved, the problem of telemetry, that is the coding of telemetric information from missiles in test launches. This is a complex matter, but to a significant extent it is connected with the success of the program, so to speak, of openness, and seeing the actions of the other side.

Matters concerning a fundamental problem, the problem of the bombers were also resolved. We found a solution here, and we will regard this matter as having been finally agreed if all the outstanding matters which we have been discussing are regarded as having been agreed.

Unfortunately, one of the small hard nuts in the talks prevented us from reaching final agreement. This matter relates to defining new types of missiles, and in particular, one of the aspects of this problem—the matter of throw weight [zabrusyvayemiy ves], the calculation of throw weight and its increase—that is, which of the stages of increasing the throw weight makes a new missile out of an old one?

[Moiseyev] I might add just that yes, for nine years, this has not simply been fruitful work, but colossal work by an enormous team of all those who have taken part in this process, everyone, the defense complex, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, and I think that we can say today that we are into the home straight. We have achieved enormous, colossal progress, and as was said today at the table where the talks were held, we have reached the point of outstretched hand.

[Kalyagin] Apart from the treaty on strategic offensive weapons, did you discuss other problems with the U.S. side? Were other accords reached?

[Bessmertnykh] We discussed the main international problems relating, primarily, to the search for ways to unfetter talks on the Near East, the Iraq problem, Afghanistan and others. Some time was also spent on bilateral matters, in particular with a view to the prospects for developing commercial and economic links. The Americans spoke of how they are now submitting to Congress a trade agreement, and of the sort of prospects...what, as it were the success of this document getting through is linked with and so on. So that,

ultimately, I would say that there was a pretty broad-ranging meeting on some of the more important issues in Soviet-U.S. relations. [end recording]

### Depart Washington 15 July

*LD1507124591 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT  
15 Jul 91*

[Text] Washington, July 15 (TASS)—On the night from Sunday to Monday, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh left Washington for home upon concluding here on Sunday negotiations with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on problems of the completion of the work on a treaty on strategic offensive arms reduction.

Chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, First Deputy Defence Minister Army General Mikhail Moiseyev and Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksey Obukhov left for home together with the Soviet foreign minister.

### Bessmertnykh, Moiseyev on Arrival in Moscow

*LD1507174291 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 1626 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[By Georgiy Shmelev]

[Excerpt] Moscow, 15 July (TASS)—This evening USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh returned to Moscow from the United States. He held three rounds of talks in Washington with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on completing the work on the strategic offensive weapons' reduction treaty. The leaders of the foreign political departments of the two countries also exchanged opinions on the present state of Soviet-U.S. relations. They examined some international and regional problems, in particular the situation in the Near East and surrounding Afghanistan.

"At the talks in Washington we managed to resolve the main problems on which differences have persisted between us and the U.S. side for several years," Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated to journalists when he arrived at "Vnukovo" airport. In the words of the minister, 12-14 problems were resolved all in all, particularly on reducing the number of ballistic missile warheads taken into consideration, and on telemetry. "The complex of issues relating to heavy bombers carrying cruise missiles was also completely resolved," he stressed.

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh noted that "so far one aspect of one of the problems remains unresolved—defining the calculation for the throw-weight of new types of missiles." "This is a very complicated task," said the minister, "since it is tied up with the future development of strategic forces." In his words it was decided to continue talks on this problem.

At the same time, continued the minister, he got the impression that there had been increased activity in the

United States in certain circles that are against reaching an accord on strategic offensive weapons. "It is perfectly obvious," he said, "that there are forces in the United States which do not want to conclude such a treaty, or at least they do not want it to be concluded right now." [passage omitted]

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1717 GMT on 15 July in a similar report adds the following information: "Mikhail Moiseyev, the member of the Soviet delegation, first deputy USSR defense minister and the chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces, noted in his turn that the document which is being elaborated—the treaty on strategic offensive weapons—"fully meets the USSR's national interests.""]

### Bessmertnykh, Moiseyev Interviewed

*LD1507182991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program  
Radio-1 Network in Russian 1626 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, by correspondent Viktor Leven, on their return from talks on strategic arms reduction in the United States at Vnukovo Airport in Moscow on 15 July—recorded]

[Text] [Levin] You already know that intensive talks on preparing the treaty of the reduction of strategic offensive weapons have been going on in Washington for four days and four nights, I stress days and nights. As a result significant progress has been made in tackling the remaining problems. The problem of lowering the ceiling of warheads which are counted on ballistic missiles has been solved. The accord on the telemetry issue, namely encrypting technical information which is obtained from missiles at the time of test launches, has been reached, and an accord has been reached with regard to bombers. There is only one difficult issue left to be resolved—the definition of the new types of missiles and the calculation of their throw-weight. When Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh and General Moiseyev, chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, landed in Vnukovo-2 Airport an hour and a half ago I was far from the only Soviet journalist who wanted to interview them. Here is a recording of the conversation:

[Levin] Is it possible to say that the treaty will move even closer to being signed by the time Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush meet in London?

[Bessmertnykh] Well, I cannot answer this question categorically at present. A lot depends on how the U.S. side prepares for the meeting. Of course, we also have yet to weigh everything and examine everything. In any case the sides have agreed to continue the discussion of this issue in London.

[Levin] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, one gets the impression that certain forces...er...opposing a Soviet-U.S. rapprochement have become more active recently, and have to some extent been hindering the progress of your talks in Washington.

[Bessmertnykh] Well, Mikhail Alekseyevich [Moiseyev] is witness to the fact that not only were we aware of this through the press and through what one might call the outline of the position to which the U.S. side sometimes adhered, but also that we saw it with our own eyes, so to speak, in the direct actions by some representatives of certain departments who were rather reluctant to move things forward toward agreements. So all of these talks were unbelievably complicated. It had to be like that, for this is one of the most complicated and complex spheres—how to translate technical details, and extremely complicated technical details which bridge many different sciences, into political terms, as Mikhail Alekseyevich quite rightly observed here. Not only that, but very often those technical details were hampered by politics—particularly politics on the other side.

So I want to say once again that the talks were very complicated. This was one of the most difficult negotiating sessions I have ever taken part in; but if you struggle something always comes out of it. It is quite natural that forces exist in the United States which do not want this treaty, or at least do not want it now.

[Levin] Mikhail Alekseyevich, observers are asserting—some of them, at least—that the treaty will contain more concessions on our side than on the U.S. side. What would your reaction be to such assertions?

[Moiseyev] I would not say so categorically. In any matter, big or small, where negotiations are going on to reach agreement, there have to be compromises of some kind. Otherwise you will never reach the truth or find the necessary parameters, which is particularly relevant to armaments. Naturally, over eight and a half years of talks all manner of things have arisen. On some occasions one side had to make concessions and on others it was necessary to hang on to our positions so as to be able to make use of them somewhere else. So through mutual understanding we came up with the parameters which were agreed today.

[Levin] The treaty which is now close to completion—is it in the interests of our national security?

[Moiseyev] I can state loudly and articulately that it is fully in the interests of national security.

### Churkin on Attempts To Complete START Talks

#### Views Upcoming Washington Talks

*OW1007080091 Moscow INTERFAX in English  
1200 GMT 9 Jul 91*

[“Diplomatic Panorama” report by P. Vassilyev and M. Mayorov: “USSR and U.S. Determined To Round Out START Talks”; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Department, Vitaliy Churkin, has said the Soviet and American foreign ministers intend to make yet another attempt to narrow their differences on the treaty on strategic offensive weapons. He told DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] reporter that "A. Bessmertnykh and J. Baker are quite likely to decide all the remaining problems at their Washington meeting on July 11-12."

According to Mr. Churkin, the Soviet delegation to the United States will be "ready to discuss any issues with a view to concluding the work on the treaty as soon as possible." At the same time, he said "it is too early to guess what particular agreements may be reached."

One should not rule out that one of the most difficult technical questions—that of telemetric monitoring—may be settled in principle, for experts from both countries to coordinate the details later. This would make the draft treaty ready for signing during the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow at the end of this month. The possibility of this course of events stems from the recent exchange of messages between the two presidents, who agree that political will must be shown to round out the START talks at an early date.

Significantly, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said a short while ago that the problem of telemetric monitoring, which had been brought up by the American side, might take years to settle through conventional negotiations over one provision after another. Since it was a very intricate technical problem, which could be decided only by a narrow group of specialists, it would, according to Mr. Bessmertnykh, require a "political decision." Judging by everything, a decision of this kind is now available.

Among the specific issues needing further coordination are: inspection of missile-assembly plants, a more distinct identification of the old missiles liable to modernization, methods of collecting and deciphering data during missiles testing, and the stock-taking procedure for the unreplaceable missile warheads.

Clearly, unless the USSR and the USA decide the remaining START-related problems politically, the treaty's signing in Moscow later in July may be disrupted. A USSR Foreign Ministry expert directly connected with the Soviet-American disarmament talks in Geneva told DP's correspondent on Tuesday that it is at the Bessmertnykh-Baker meeting on July 11-12 that the treaty's future may be decided. The best possible option would be for the two ministers to settle the remaining five questions which the Soviet side regards as an indivisible whole and which are still hampering the treaty's finalization.

In acknowledging the helpfulness of the exchange of messages between Presidents Bush and Gorbachev, the Soviet military expert observed that the Americans should show "greater flexibility and readiness for concession" at the START talks with the USSR.

Diplomats at the Foreign Ministry's USA and Canada Department told DP's reporter that the unsettled problems could be included in a separate protocol and submitted to experts for additional coordination after the treaty's signing. They indicated that the two-day meeting between Bessmertnykh and Baker could hear debates over the agenda of the Moscow summit and embrace the entire range of bilateral, international, regional, military, and humanitarian issues concerning both countries. The diplomats said the package of international problems would be likely to include the situation in Yugoslavia and in the rest of Europe, Iraq's fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolution 687 and Washington's threat to use force against Baghdad if the latter continued barring international inspectors from its nuclear installations. The Soviet and American leaders could be expected to discuss ways of settling the Middle East crisis in the context of the latest series of negotiations with the countries directly involved in the conflict.

Afghanistan is still a "hot spot" and an area where the Soviet Union and the United States are yet to tap their settlement potentials. The American side may raise the question of Soviet assistance to Cuba. The package of regional problems may also include the situation in Cambodia and Ethiopia. As far as the South African situation is concerned, the diplomats believe Moscow is unlikely to boost its economic relations with Pretoria, although Washington has been encouraging it to do so.

#### Comments at Press Briefing

PM0807223791 Moscow *IZVESTIYA* in Russian  
9 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[Unattributed report on news conference by Vitaliy Churkin, Foreign Ministry Information Administration chief, under the general heading: "Technical Details' or 'Substantive Problems'"]

[Text] The Soviet position on the talks on the reduction of strategic offensive arms was set out the other day at a briefing by Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration. We now cite his comments on this topic.

In the past few days another round of intensive efforts by Soviet and U.S. top-level negotiators ended in Geneva, where conversations took place between the USSR deputy foreign minister and the U.S. under secretary of state. Although no dramatic breakthroughs were achieved, nonetheless, it seems that some useful work was done.

I would like to explain that the problem involves the remaining three areas of technical problems which have still to be resolved for the conclusion of a treaty constitute a package. Therefore, until all the many technical details have been settled it cannot be said that these questions have been fully resolved. In other words, at the moment we cannot say that these problems have been fully resolved but both sides expressed certain ideas which, in our opinion, help matters to progress.

Now Under Secretary R. Bartholomew and Deputy Minister A.A. Obukhov are returning. Clearly, further reflections are needed. This is the conventional working process. The additional study of questions will, we believe, make it possible to achieve further progress and ultimately lead to the completion of the elaboration of the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. If that happens in the next few weeks the Soviet-U.S. summit will take place at the end of July. The days and weeks ahead will show whether that is actually going to happen.

### Bush Reportedly Set 'Deadline' for START Completion

PM1107103591 Moscow *IZVESTIYA* in Russian  
9 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[By V. Nadein under the general heading "Technical Details" or "Substantive Problems?": "U.S. Press on G. Bush Message to M.S. Gorbachev"]

[Text] Washington—"I want their team to make progress as quickly as ours," said U.S. President Bush when explaining why he recently sent another personal message to M.S. Gorbachev on strategic arms reduction problems.

Now that the Soviet side has met virtually all the Americans' demands regarding divergences in the interpretation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, the main obstacle in a meeting between the two countries' leaders in Moscow is considered here to be the agreement on strategic arms. Or, more precisely, certain features on which the differences of opinion in recent weeks have hardly diminished at all.

Even though White House spokesman R. Popadiuk confirmed that G. Bush has sent M.S. Gorbachev a message he refused to divulge the details. Of course, this secret lasted just minutes. "The details were received via other administration officials," THE NEW YORK TIMES reported impassively.

According to these information leaks, cited in abundance by all the U.S. mass media on Sunday, Bush has set a quite rigorous deadline: If the main differences between the sides are not settled in the next week there will be no time for the meeting in Moscow before the U.S. President's August vacation—and then the entire schedule will have to be rewritten.

In the opinion of the White House boss, the past two weeks of talks in Geneva produced virtually nothing. Bush sees one of the main reasons in the fact that "he sent to Geneva a U.S. team equipped with considerable power and flexibility in their work whereas the Soviet participants in the talks were evidently not endowed with similar flexibility" (the NEW YORK TIMES).

As Bush stated last week, the talks on strategic arms "are 96 percent ready. We are near to some fine arms control

points." But the remaining 4 percent are causing Washington concern, as a result of which the U.S. President is thought to suggest in his message to Gorbachev that USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker meet in Washington this week for the final effort.

Back in December 1990, during a visit to the United States by E.A. Shevardnadze, the then foreign minister, the sides expressed satisfaction at the high level of readiness of the treaty and called the remaining disagreements "technical details." Now G. Bush terms them "substantive problems," which permit no ambiguity.

As the U.S. press reports, there are four contentious points in the treaty. The procedure for the inspection of missile-producing enterprises, the more precise definition of the modernization of old missiles and of methods for deciphering missile test data, and the system for calculating the reduction of warheads on missiles not subject to dismantling.

It is reported that G. Bush reaffirmed in his message his desire to meet with M.S. Gorbachev in Moscow. He does not intend insisting that the signing of a strategic weapons treaty during his Moscow visit is essential although he would prefer not to make the trip if the main problems are not resolved in the near future.

Last week in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives Bush was criticized a number of times for allegedly rushing the new treaty too much, which could lead to mistakes. Legislators believe that Bush is not making enough use of the advantages deriving from the gravity of the Soviet Union's economic position and M.S. Gorbachev's extreme interest in a summit at the earliest possible date. Bush's message to the Soviet president, observers believe, is to some extent an answer to that criticism.

### Military Official on Technical Issues in Washington Talks

LD1107150491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service  
in English 1210 GMT 11 Jul 91

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, and the American secretary of state, Mr. James Baker, are meeting in Washington on 11 and 12 July to finalize the draft of the treaty on considerable reduction of strategic arms. The chief of the General Staff, Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, is a member of the delegation. Our military observer Vadim Solovyev interviews Colonel Vladimir Nosarenko, an expert on disarmament:

[Begin Nosarenko recording] The sides are to discuss the yet uncoordinated technical details: first, how to register warheads of the ballistic missiles that aren't subject to dismantling; second, how to decipher the data provided by the missile testing. As is known, part of the telemetric data transmitted from the missile during the test flight is coded. The problem, therefore, is how to determine that

the data fully reflect the correspondence of the concrete flight of the missile to the agreed parameters. Third, how to inspect the industrial plants that manufacture strategic missiles. And finally, the fourth detail, what could be considered as the missile of a new type. Unless these details are coordinated the problem will remain. [end recording]

Western mass media offer the view that the Soviet military allegedly drags on with finalizing the treaty. Col. Vladimir Nosarenko again:

[Begin Nosarenko recording] These allegations are groundless. The Soviet delegation is not divided into diplomats and military men. It is a single whole. The Soviet delegation is authorized to do business by high state bodies of power and acts correspondingly. [end recording]

So, that was his view. But the American side thinks otherwise. But, anyway, these technical details have been unsolved for already six months. What's next? I think, says our military correspondent Vadim Solovyev, that now it's up to the high-ranking politicians to have their say. It was due to their active interference that the disputed clauses were coordinated in the treaty on the conventional armaments in Europe and President Bush submitted the document to the American Senate for ratification. The heads of the foreign policy departments of the Soviet Union and the United States seem to have received instructions to actively search for a compromise.

I hope we can achieve progress, said the Soviet Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh upon his arrival in Washington. And General Moiseyev also voiced hope that at the talks the sides would manage to untangle the remaining knots, should moves be reciprocal. And both presidents, too, could dot the i's during their meeting in London on 17 July. There is hope, therefore, that President Bush would visit Moscow in late July or early August.

#### Navy Group Preparing for START Inspections

PM1007150791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA  
in Russian 4 Jul 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Captain First Rank V. Makarov, officer from the Northern Fleet Staff, by Senior Lieutenant A. Bystrov, datelined Northern Fleet; date not given; first paragraph is an introduction: "It Is Expensive To Arm, But It Is No Cheaper To Disarm"]

[Text] It is known that intensive talks are going on between the USSR and the United States about concluding a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms. But not many people know that work has already started on preparations for implementing this treaty's terms. Thus, for example, a group is

being formed in the Northern Fleet to ensure the implementation of this treaty. Our stringer talked to Captain First Rank V. Makarov, an officer from the Northern Fleet Staff.

[Bystrov] Vadim Pavlovich, what is the purpose of creating the group and what are its tasks?

[Makarov] In general the aim is evident from its name. As for its functions, broadly speaking they are as follows: Registering data about the quantity and condition of strategic offensive and conventional arms—in simple terms, ballistic missiles, launchers for these missiles, and other naval arms, and also preparing for and assisting in inspections by the U.S. side. If the treaty is signed and ratified, it is expected that its implementation will begin with mutual inspections. Under the proposed terms of the treaty, several types of inspections are envisaged. The frequency of inspections can be very varied. Under the existing draft treaty, the U.S. side is obliged to give notice of an intended inspection at least 24 hours prior to the arrival of the group of inspectors. Following the inspectors' arrival, they must inform us of the installation they intend to inspect and then the Soviet side must take them to the indicated installation. The members of our group will have to meet the U.S. inspectors here, in the fleet, and will have to create all the necessary conditions for the inspection to be performed in strict accordance with stipulated procedures.

That is why we are already elaborating a standard package of documents for all our bases for submarines with ballistic missiles on board, which includes a provision on the procedure for inspections, schedules for the group's travel routes, and a time study of operations, and identifies the responsible officials.

[Bystrov] It is perfectly obvious that no one has yet been involved in such work in the fleet. And its success will probably depend to a great extent on who will be in the group...

[Makarov] The list of posts was only confirmed quite recently. But we have already started recruiting people. And we are mainly taking into account the nature of the tasks they will have to resolve. The group must include first and foremost competent specialist missilemen. But we must not forget about the provision of transport, food, and kit, or about the observance of secret and secure communications procedures.

Several officers are now working in the group. They have all displayed responsibility in assimilating their new task.

[Bystrov] In any new task you cannot avoid difficulties and unforeseen obstacles...

[Makarov] Unfortunately, there are more of these than we would like, or that there might have been, in our view. Many people somehow do not think about the fact that the disarmament process also requires money or that we cannot count on an instantaneous economic or

any other kind of effect here. And I think that it would be reasonable if our government thought about the centralized financing of the treaty's implementation when preparing the draft of this treaty. But in fact it has so happened that the brunt of material expenditure has fallen on the Navy.

Earlier, we, as indeed the Americans, were not preparing for the disarmament process. And this means, notably, that our whole infrastructure was not geared to this work. And now we have to rack our brains over how to resolve the transport problem, and how to ensure the necessary procedure on the transportation routes that the group of inspectors is going to take. Furthermore, we must concern ourselves with the creation of the appropriate conditions for the inspectors to carry out their duties. For example, we must construct a special building at each base for strategic nuclear submarines, where U.S. inspectors and Soviet representatives can hold a conference, formulate documents, and finally, relax. We already have to think about how to act in various situations connected with carrying out the stipulated procedures during the inspection of installations. Nor are we ignoring the effect of the weather conditions that are characteristic of the North on the inspection process.

We acquired a certain amount of practical experience in organizing our group's work in 1990-1991, when the Northern Fleet twice received U.S. representatives headed by Rear Admiral Fox.

There is also another problem, one that is no less significant than the financial one. It is rooted in people's mentality, in the inertia of their thinking. Certain officials cannot comprehend the full importance of the new task, and their attitude to our work is as if it were something temporary. And whereas, for example, we have managed to solve the problem of providing helicopters for the inspections with help from the fleet air force commander, as yet not everything is going well as regards the construction of the necessary buildings.

The earlier we all realize this, the better: Disarmament is not a short-term campaign, but a long-term prospect, one that requires great financial and material expenditure.

#### **U.S. Figures Call for 95-Percent Strategic Arms Cuts**

91WC0122A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian No 26, 29 Jun 91 p 12

[Observer Gennadiy Gerasimov's "The World at the End of the Week" column: "But the Atom Is Still in Uniform"]

[Text] The rhetorical flourishes "provided there is no war" are no longer audible. We have already become accustomed to this gift of perestroika. The about-face in foreign policy has removed the subject of the military

atom from the pages of the newspapers, while the peaceful atom which rebelled in Chernobyl has distorted the nuclear phobia.

Yet somewhere nuclear weapons are being cleaned and greased so that they will be ready if.... And missile crematorium delivery systems, which are efficient as it is, are even being upgraded. Although their owners are now peaceably disposed toward one another, and it is hard to imagine what could set them at odds once again.

Why, then, the duty alert at the nuclear furnaces? In life, as in the theater also, a gun hanging on a wall could go off on its own accord. The situation worries at least three people: Hans Bethe and Kurt Gottfried, American physicists, and Robert McNamara, former president of the World Bank and former U.S. defense secretary under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. It may be recalled for the sake of truth that equal alarm was also expressed several years ago by a group of Soviet scientists who took part in compiling the report "Strategic Stability Under the Conditions of a Radical Reduction in Nuclear Arms." The authors showed here that a few percent of the American and Soviet nuclear arsenals are sufficient to ensure strategic stability and peace. It is possible that the report appeared prematurely and that public opinion and diplomacy were not ready at that time for a "radical reduction." The report passed unnoticed.

Now the above-mentioned American trio have published, on 27 June in the journal NEW YORK REVIEW OF BUSINESS, something akin to a manifesto under the heading "Nuclear Weapons: A Proposal." This proposal essentially concurs with the above-mentioned report: The defensive sufficiency ceiling is somewhere around the level of five percent of the present nuclear arsenals of the United States and the USSR. Or, put another way, the sides' "overkill" surplus is 20-fold. Or, in figures, 1,000 nuclear warheads a side is sufficient, counting both strategic and tactical delivery systems. These reduced arsenals, preserved as yet for the sake of deterrence, should be invulnerable to a first strike. Otherwise there would be no convincing threat of a retaliatory strike. It is, accordingly, time to apply the brakes to military-engineering thought, which is hurtling toward the abyss, to preserve the ABM Treaty, to halt nuclear testing, to not manufacture weapons designed to "decapitate" the leadership of the other side, and so forth.

These changes in military planning are dictated by common sense. For example, the strategy of "flexible response" providing for the possibility of launching nuclear weapons was intended at some stage of a military complex [as published] to prevent an invasion of West Europe by the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact. The authors of the report comment: "The legitimacy of this aspect of nuclear strategy had always been open to question. But now it has vanished completely on account of the collapse of Soviet power in Central and East Europe.

Within the framework of the Soviet-American confrontation, which has been turned by perestroika simply into a comparison, "the present size and composition of the sides' strategic forces are not only extravagant anachronisms but are becoming also a slumbering threat, which can no longer be justified.... The present strategic forces do not serve the interests either of the United States or the Soviet Union."

McNamara and the others insistently counsel that the United States take the initiative here. They are worried not by the power of our missile forces but their security. They also have in mind the textbook gun on the wall when they warn: "Chernobyl and a number of tragedies with Soviet submarines, ships, and oil pipelines point to the particular susceptibility of Soviet organizations to so-called normal accidents, and we are hardly immune to them either."

Of course, there are many aspects to this problem. The smooth involvement of the other nuclear powers, which may be expected only following the requisite steps of the two leading powers, is essential. After all, even after the conclusion of a START treaty, the authors remind us, the United States will be left with approximately 9,000 strategic warheads, the Soviet Union with approximately 8,000, and tactical nuclear weapons will remain also, whereas China, Britain, and France together have little more than 1,500 warheads. And all nuclear powers must reinforce nuclear nonproliferation procedures, which is best done by the imposition of a ban on nuclear testing and the introduction of international inspection of nuclear weapon deployment sites.

## SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

### Discussion of GPALS Variant of SDI

91WC0125A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA  
in Russian No 64, 1 Jun 91 p 4

[Article by Vadim Kozyulin under USA rubric: "Strategic Defense Initiative, a Critical Year: Will the American Space Program Ensure Peace Throughout the World?"]

[Text] In accordance with a chain of circumstances, precisely on 2 August, the day when Iraq occupied Kuwait, President Bush made a speech in which he outlined the contours of the new military strategy of the United States in the period after the end of the Cold War. "Today we need not simply reductions but reconstruction," he said. This means that the United States will strive to gain military and technological leadership. An important role in the plans of the President is assigned to the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] program: the time is approaching when the walls of secret laboratories will become too confining for it.

The battle for Kuwait summarized the thinking of American strategists on the future of SDI. The successful firings of the "Patriot" systems gave the American

administration an almost Biblically correct argument in favor of the idea that SDI is not "star wars" but stellar peace.

On 24 April, Henry Cooper, the director of the agency for the realization of SDI, addressing the Senate, presented his latest project—the GPALS [Global Protection Against Limited Strikes] system. The creators of SDI believe that GPALS is capable of protecting against an accidental or intentional missile strike by the USSR or third country against the United States and its allies. "Global" means continuous coverage on a worldwide scale, "protection" the readiness to destroy any systems of a missile attack, and "limited strike" a strike with a strength of up to 200 delivery systems.

Under the project, the GPALS will consist of three components subject to a single control system. The first element is a field system for protection against tactical ballistic missiles that will be deployed by the mid-1990's. Among other things, this will include "Patriot" complexes of a new generation. This system will be transported on ships and it will be possible to deploy it easily in the theater of military operations. The second element of the GPALS is a land-based system of protection for the destruction of ballistic missiles that will go into operation by the end of the decade. It will be located in six zones in the territory of the United States (including the Hawaiian Islands and Alaska) and will include mobile "Brilliant Eyes" sensors on land and in space and also about 750 land-based interception systems. A third element of the GPALS will go into operation along with the land-based protective system—a space defense tier made up of 1,000 "Brilliant Pebbles"—conventional interceptor missiles that will knock out strategic and tactical ballistic missiles at a range of 500 to 1,000 km.

According to preliminary calculations, the establishment of the GPALS will cost \$46 billion. This sum is approximately equal to the expenditures for the entire military campaign against the forces of Husayn. It is not easy to convince the congressmen to come up with the funding for this. There are no superfluous billions in the American treasury. Still, the current situation favors an attack on Congress. With a technological push, the United States is capable of taking the lead in the world in the military area and they openly speak about such a goal in America. The establishment of the GPALS will help to prevent the spread of nuclear and missile technologies in the Third World and this is also a trump of the fathers of SDI in relation to Congress. This is why Cooper says that this year is critical for SDI.

The American shuttle "Discovery" completed its 12th flight at the beginning of May. It brought news from space that was encouraging for the military people: the tests of the controlled detection of Soviet missiles in space were successful. What was done in space was called a "real space ballet" by one of the representatives of the program. It was the start of the creation of a guided space weapon—those same "Brilliant Pebbles." It is certainly no accident that this launch coincided with the removal

of many "secret" stamps from the SDI program: the program has many adversaries even among its own and today propaganda is more important than secrecy.

In America, they sincerely hope that space systems will guarantee peace for the planet. The words of U.S. Secretary of Defense Cheney are filled with a missionary pathos: "This is a strategy that recognizes the importance of the continuing historical role that the defense of America has played."

### INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

#### U.S. Team Inspects Kazakhstan Munitions Factory

*LD1507142791 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[By Olga Babiy]

[Text] Petropavlovsk, July 15 (TASS)—A group of American experts led by Captain Thomas Andersson departed for Moscow today from Petropavlovsk, a regional centre in Kazakhstan, where a munitions factory is situated. The group has carried out another inspection under the Soviet-American treaty on the destruction of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

Under the treaty, the group of eight inspectors was equipped with visual, radio-measuring and other control instruments, had the right to move without any restrictions around the region and had access to any military or civil installation.

During the inspection, an expert of the group purchased a bicycle for his son, the production of which was started by the factory in line with its conversion plans. "It's a good bike made at the level of world standards," Americans told factory representatives.

"The production of mechanisms which will help Mankind preserve the Earth's ecology for posterity, conforms most of all to the tasks of conversion," Andersson said. He stressed that, judging by the results of the inspection, the Soviet Union consistently observes the treaty's provisions.

The group has not run into any obstacles during its inspection in Kazakhstan, he added. They did not detect production or stockpiling of missiles.

#### 12 Nuclear-Tipped Scud Missiles Removed From Germany

*LD1307182291 Berlin ADN in German 1745 GMT 13 Jul 91*

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—In the past week the Soviet Union has withdrawn 12 more missiles with nuclear warheads from the territory of the former GDR. The BERLINER KURIER AM SONNTAG learned this from Soviet military sources.

Thus, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has kept a promise he made to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl during their meeting in Kiev last week. They were improved Scud missiles with a range of 2,000 kms [range given as received].

The so-called Fox's Den, the German command headquarters of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact in the event of nuclear war, has in the meantime awakened the interest of American arms producers. Last week a delegation from a U.S. company inspected the establishment in a disused mine near Bad Saarow, in the Rauen Hills. The four floors, under 20 meters of concrete, were still full of the most modern electronics at the Soviet Union's disposal. The missiles near Waren-Mueritz, Pinneberg near Schwedt, Jena-Lobeda, Eisenach, and Lychen had been controlled from the "Fox's Den". The establishment had been handed over to the Bundeswehr. (The article was pre-released in an edited version—ADN)

### CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

#### Grinevskiy: Situation at CSBM Talks 'Rather Serious'

*LD1507223291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1552 GMT 15 Jul 91*

[By Vladimir Smelov]

[Excerpts] Vienna, 15 July (TASS)—The results of the fourth session of the new stage of Vienna talks on confidence- and security-building measures [CSBM's] in Europe, which ended here today, could hardly be called impressive. [passage omitted]

The situation which is emerging at the talks is rather serious, Oleg Grinevskiy, the head of the Soviet delegation, said in his conversation with the TASS correspondent. A question arises whether some partners of ours think that the talks have exhausted themselves. He believes that if a radical change is not taking place in the course of the next session, then the participants in the forum on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe might come to the forthcoming summit in Helsinki empty-handed.

#### U.S. Senate Takes Up Ratification of CFE Treaty

##### Bush Urges Ratification

*PM1207155191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 91 Union Edition p 5*

[By A. Blinov: "Preparing to Ratify Treaty"]

[Text] Washington—U.S. President G. Bush submitted the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe [CFE] to the Senate for ratification last Tuesday [9 July].

In a letter accompanying the text of the treaty, the head of the U.S. Administration noted that the first conventional arms reduction agreement in Europe since World

War II, signed by 22 NATO and former Warsaw Pact countries, is the "widest-ranging" arms control accord. The treaty "prescribes unprecedented arms reductions, strengthening the security of the United States, Canada, and the countries of Europe."

"This is the first time that the countries of Europe have, in conjunction with the United States and Canada, agreed to cut back and limit the numerical strength of their ground-based conventional arms, particularly the hardware needed to conduct offensive operations," the U.S. President noted. "The numerical limits set by the treaty strengthen stability by removing the imbalance of forces and restrict opportunities for a surprise attack and wide-ranging offensive operations in Europe."

The letter points out that the treaty makes provision not only for radical cuts in the quantity of arms and military hardware belonging to NATO and former Warsaw Pact countries, but also for a carefully elaborated system to monitor its fulfillment, exchange of data on the command structure of each country's armed forces, and the deployment of its arms and military hardware subject to the limitations.

"The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe," the U.S. President's letter says, "is an important element in creating the foundation of the architecture of European security following the end of the 'cold war.' Only after this foundation has been created will we be able to move away from confrontation to cooperation as the foundation of European security and order."

Stressing that the treaty deserves "speedy, favorable examination," the U.S. President in traditional legalese asked the Senate to "advise and consent" to its ratification. Under the U.S. Constitution, the ratification of international agreements comprises two acts: Senate approval of the treaty followed by the President's signature to the act of ratification.

According to reports from U.S. Senate circles, the Senate will begin the process of examining the treaty next Thursday with hearings at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—Secretary of State J. Baker is to testify before the committee. The U.S. press reports that a group of members of the Senate committee recently sent a letter to President G. Bush assuring him of their readiness to hold the hearings within a compressed period and complete their recommendations to the Senate regarding ratification of the treaty by the end of this month.

U.S. observers noted that the letter was signed not only by Committee Chairman C. Pell, but also by leading Republican J. Helms, who is usually critical of arms control agreements. The Senate Armed Services and Intelligence Committees will hold hearings on the treaty in September. The treaty will be examined by the full Senate once these have ended.

### PRAVDA on Bush Message

PM1507085291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 91  
Second Edition pp 1, 5

[By unnamed PRAVDA correspondent: "Ratification Lies Ahead"]

[Text] Washington—The Treaty on the Reduction of Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, which has been on the shelf since November of last year, has been submitted for consideration by the U.S. Senate for ratification. The administration, as is well known, refused to begin the ratification process because of differences with the USSR over the interpretation of a number of articles of this agreement, which was signed in Paris by 22 states.

President Bush was not exaggerating when, in his accompanying message to the Senate, he described it as the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. Calling on the legislators to come to an early and favorable decision, the President noted in his message: "The Treaty is the first conventional arms control agreement since World War II. It marks the first time in history that European nations, together with the United States and Canada, have agreed to reduce and numerically limit their land-based arms, especially the offensive type. Significantly, the reductions will eliminate the overwhelming Soviet numerical advantage in conventional armaments that has existed in Europe for more than 40 years. The Treaty's limits enhance stability by ending force disparities. They limit the capability for launching surprise attacks and initiating large-scale offensive action in Europe."

Bush particularly highlights the fact that the Treaty "will be of major importance in laying the indispensable foundation for the post-Cold War security architecture in Europe." "Only with this foundation in place," G. Bush's message says, "can we move from a European security order based on confrontation to one based on cooperation."

The difficulties in drafting the accord and the volume of work done are obvious. After all, it covers more than 20 countries and tens of thousands of items of arms deployed on a territory from the Atlantic to the Urals. It was necessary to agree on weapons classifications, counting rules, methods of destroying equipment subject to reduction, and verification and monitoring rules. Really titanic labor was invested.

Under the provisions of the agreement, NATO and the countries of the voluntarily disbanded Warsaw Pact are to reduce their conventional arms to identical levels: 20,000 tanks, 30,000 armed vehicles, 20,000 artillery pieces, 2,000 combat helicopters, and 6,800 combat aircraft. We will have to cut more weapons than others. But we had many times more. Parity is parity...

The Treaty will be approved if two-thirds of the senators vote for it.

**Further on Troop Withdrawals From Poland****Engineers Battalion Leaves Szczeczin**

*PM0907143391 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Jul 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report over video from Szczeczin]

[Text] A Northern Group of Forces battalion of combat engineers has left Szczeczin for the USSR. There are no more Soviet soldiers in the city now.

The return of military units to the motherland continues even though no treaty on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland has yet been signed. In the space of one month alone more than 1,500 railcars loaded with military freight have been dispatched to the USSR.

**Pontoon Battalion Leaving Torun**

*PM1507102191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jul 91 First Edition p 3*

[By V. Burbulis: "First Train"]

[Text] Warsaw, 10 July—The withdrawal of the 902nd Separate Pontoon Battalion of the Northern Group of Forces from Torun (Northern Poland) has begun. The first transport train carrying heavy equipment has set out by railroad for the USSR. It will take three such trains to move out all the equipment, the unit's entire personnel, and the servicemen's families.

**Talks Held 9-10 Jul**

*LD1007133191 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 10 Jul 91*

[Text] Warsaw, July 10 (TASS)—Another round of Soviet-Polish talks on the pull-out of Soviet troops from the Republic of Poland and other related issues took place in Warsaw between July 9-10.

During the talks, held in a constructive atmosphere, the delegations discussed all key issues connected with determining the timeframe of troops withdrawal, including the pull-out of combat units, settlement of property issues, and transit of Soviet troops through Germany.

The sides have agreed to report the results of this round to their leaderships and continue talks shortly.

**U.S. Requests CSBM Inspection in Kiev Area****Inspection Team Arrives**

*LD0607175691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1717 GMT 6 Jul 91*

[Text] Moscow, 6 July (TASS)—It has been officially reported here today that on 1 July 1991, in accordance with the articles laid down in the Vienna document of

1990 on confidence-building measures and security [CSBM's] in Europe, the Government of the United States made a request to the Soviet Union on evaluating information about military forces and plans for the deployment of basic weapons systems and equipment in the 110th Motorized Rifle Guards Regiment of the Kiev Military District.

The U.S. request to carry out this inspection of the situation has been agreed to.

Today, U.S. representatives arrived on the territory of the Kiev Military District and have started work.

**Team Satisfied With Inspection**

*LD0907222291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0733 GMT 9 Jul 91*

[Text] Kiev, 9 July (UKRINFORM-TASS)—A group of U.S. representatives has arrived in Kiev Military District to assess information about the Armed Forces. This visit is the first step on the road of practical implementation of the 1990 Vienna document on confidence- and security-building measures [CSBM's] in Europe, which came into force from 1 July this year.

For 12 hours the American military specialists verified the presence of combat equipment and arms in the 110th Guards Motorized Rifle Regiment, which is commanded by Lieutenant Colonel of Guards I. Ploskonos, Hero of the Soviet Union.

As Colonel V. Istomin, head of the department responsible for ensuring that the treaty on the reduction of arms is implemented in the district, told the UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent, the American side was satisfied with the outcome of the inspection.

**Command Slows Pace of Withdrawal From Germany**

*PM1107132191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS correspondent V. Katayev report: "Press Conference in Potsdam"]

[Text] Berlin, 5 July—Questions of the schedule and pace of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from German territory, including from Brandenburg, were at the center of attention at a press conference held today in Potsdam and organized by the Western Group of Forces Command Authority and the Brandenburg Land Government.

Addressing the press conference, Colonel V. Strelnikov, spokesman of the Western Group of Forces Staff, noted that as of 12 May this year 28 percent (almost 44,000 men) of the total number of Soviet servicemen and their families due for withdrawal in 1991 had been withdrawn, together with 85 percent of tanks (867 vehicles) and 61 percent (260,000 tonnes) of diverse military equipment respectively.

The group's command authorities were endeavoring to strictly and rigorously comply with the obligations they had assumed to oversee the plan and schedule of the withdrawal of troops from Germany. But today the situation regarding this question had somewhat changed.

In this context, Col. V. Strelnikov drew the attention of journalists to the recent statement by the commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces to the effect that the Soviet side is compelled to somewhat slow the pace of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from July. Whereas 22,000 servicemen left Germany in June, in July this figure would be 13,000. The main reason behind this decision is the Soviet Union's shortage of housing, which was not developed in time by the German side as envisaged by the relevant agreement between the USSR and FRG governments. It would be irresponsible to send thousands of people to the Union with nowhere to settle there, and with winter about to set in.

In his statement G. Domke [name as transliterated], the Brandenburg prime minister's plenipotentiary on Soviet troops and conversion questions, expressed understanding for the difficulties which have arisen.

#### **Delegation Outlines Position on CFE Personnel Reductions**

*LD0407191391 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT  
4 Jul 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna, July 4—Limitation of personnel of the countries participating in the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe [CFE] were in the focus of attention of a regular plenary meeting of that forum today. Several months ago the Soviet delegation set out its viewpoint on this problem, and now Western partners at last expressed their readiness to join in this work.

Preliminary debates have shown that there are many points of contact on a number of important aspects of the matter. There is an agreement in principle regarding the basis on which the agreement should be worked out: national, collective, or taking into consideration both aspects.

The sides believe that personnel reductions could be made on the basis of national limitations for each participating state. This is a logical approach. Only in this way national peculiarities of the forming of armed forces, their training and the ensurance of external security can be taken into consideration more fully and painlessly. In addition, there will be no temptation to apply some common scheme to national levels which would most probably lead the negotiations into an impasse.

A complex work to draft an agreement limiting the forces personnel is ahead. The Soviet delegation believes that the following principles should be observed in this work.

First, the agreement should be easily implemented, which means that it must be streamlined in form and readily understandable in contents, that it should take into consideration the realities that formed in the recent years in Europe, including the elimination of the military organisation of the Warsaw Treaty and Soviet troop withdrawal from East European countries.

Second, it should be linked with the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe, should take into consideration many of its provisions, including the exchange of information, verification, levels of arms limitations.

Third, the agreement should be flexible enough so that there should be no need for radical changes in the practice of ensuring external and internal security in separate countries.

A number of countries made proposals for personnel limitation at today's meeting.

#### **NUCLEAR TESTING**

##### **Locals To Decide on Semipalatinsk Tests**

*PM0907211991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA  
PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 91 p 1*

[AZIYA-PRESS report: "President Says: There's No Need!"]

[Text] The Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] presidential press service has denied the SIBINFORM report that appeared in the central mass media saying that Nursultan Nazarbayev had allegedly agreed to two nuclear explosions being carried out at the Semipalatinsk test range this year.

This claim does not match up to reality. Nazarbayev's position on the test range's future has not changed: Only people living in that region can decide on the problems connected with carrying out explosions there. A recent Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet session decided to hold a referendum on this issue in three oblasts of Kazakhstan. Thus, the final response to the military departments' request to carry out explosions at the test range depends solely on the will of the people.

##### **Anti-Nuclear Movement Establishes New Fund**

*LD0807131591 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT  
8 Jul 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Ganzha]

[Text] Alma-Ata, July 8 (TASS)—The Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement working for a full ban on nuclear weapons tests recently set up the Public Health Fund.

"We succeeded in suspending the work of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site with people's diplomacy and there

was not a single underground explosion there last year and this year," poet Olzhas Suleymenov, who leads the movement said.

"We now aim to rehabilitate the health of people in areas affected by tests of weapons of mass destruction," he said.

Scientists from Alma-Ata and Leningrad designed installations to produce clean drinking water in contaminated areas, he said.

The installations will be provided to people in villages around the semipalatinsk site free of charge, he said.

The new fund aims to raise money to build hospitals, rehabilitation centres, medical factories and sanatoria in environmental-disaster zones in Kazakhstan.

"We work in close cooperation with international public and parliamentary organisations and parliaments in Kazakhstan and other Soviet republics. We hope this will enable us to reach our goals—ensure healthy normal living conditions for all," Suleymenov concluded.

### Further on Controversy Over Nuclear Testing in Kazakhstan

#### Two More Tests Planned for Semipalatinsk

PM0907111591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA  
PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 p 1

[SIBINFORM report: "Blasting Work in Kazakhstan To End"]

[Text] The question of the fate of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site, where for 40 years they have carried out major nuclear weapons tests whose effects have affected not only the inhabitants of Kazakhstan but also those of adjacent areas of Siberia, has been finally decided.

As IAN has reported, President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan has stated that there will be another two nuclear explosions at the test site near Semipalatinsk before the end of this year, but they will be the last nuclear weapons tests in Kazakhstan.

Previously the Defense Council under the USSR president had adopted a decision on ending nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test site from January 1993. The Kazakh Republic Supreme Soviet advocated the immediate ending of tests, however.

Meanwhile, according to Nazarbayev, the military is insisting on carrying out two explosions of a nuclear device, offering to pay financial compensation to the Kazakhstan Government for this. "We consider this insulting to the Kazakh people," the president noted.

According to physicians' data, in the last few years the number of patients with leukopenia and other dangerous illnesses in the test site's area, which exceeds 18,000 square km, has doubled. Nevertheless, a poll carried out

among the population living in immediate proximity to the test site showed that inhabitants are allowing another two explosions to be carried out. From 1 January 1992, after the nuclear weapons have been shut down, the test site will be used as a scientific research center.

#### Antinuclear Leader Comments

OW1507121191 Moscow INTERFAX in English  
1230 GMT 13 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Oljas Suleimanov, USSR people's deputy and leader of Kazakhstan's Union of Writers who is the head of the antinuclear movement "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" has said it's premature to speak about a total end to nuclear tests at the local test site since at the moment the question of conducting three calibrating explosions is under consideration.

According to what O. Suleimanov told newsmen in Alma Ata, the military have taken the following stance: if these three test explosions take place, the areas adjoining the test site will get a compensation in the amount of 5 billion rubles. Compensations, said Suleimanov, should be paid regardless of whether the tests are continued or not.

The issue of stopping or continuing nuclear tests in the area of Semipalatinsk, he reminded those present, is supposed to be resolved based on the outcome of a referendum to be held in three regions adjoining the test site.

#### Kazakh Supreme Soviet Debates Nuclear Testing

91WC0128A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA  
in Russian No 77, 2 Jul 91 p 3

[Article by Andrey Irtenyev: "Kazakhstan": "The Last Series of Tests: Whether or Not There Will Be Testing To Be Determined by a Referendum"]

[Text] The day of the most heated debate in the republic parliament was probably last Wednesday. On that day the possibility of conducting a series of three low-power detonations was on the agenda; the series is supposed to mark the end of the long-range nuclear testing program in Kazakhstan.

The Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Atomic Power and Industry, which are insisting on conducting the tests, justified their position by claiming that without this series many years of work by nuclear scientists and millions spent by the Ministry of Defense would be wasted. Furthermore, the lack of the final stage of testing would devalue the findings of dozens of previous tests; the sacrifices of the people who suffered as a result of them would have been made in vain... The ministry representatives generously backed up their arguments with promises of major financial compensation.

The members of parliament in turn used the Declaration of Sovereignty adopted by the last Supreme Soviet session as their main counterargument: the declaration categorically prohibits the testing of any weapons of mass destruction in Kazakhstan.

Since this Supreme Soviet session was held behind closed doors under conditions of complete secrecy, no reports were issued either to the press or to the public. According to unofficial information, at the decisive moment in the debate President Nazarbayev proposed a compromise which satisfied the majority. Taking into consideration the arguments of the defense ministry officials and nuclear scientists on the one hand and the arguments of the members of parliament on the other, as well as the difficult economic situation and sociopolitical situation in the republic as well as other factors which make it impossible to resolve this problem within the framework of a session of parliament, the president proposed that the matter be submitted to a general referendum in the three oblasts where the nuclear testing site is located: Semipalatinsk, Pavlodar and Karaganda. This option was approved by a majority vote.

#### Further on Economic Value of Novaya Zemlya

91WC0124A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA  
in Russian 12 Jun 91 First edition p 2

[Article by A. Vyuchenskiy, people's deputy of the USSR and member of USSR Supreme Soviet, under "Point of View" rubric: "Can One Sow on Novaya Zemlya?"]

[Text] It was under such a heading that on 1 May of this year KRASNAYA ZVEZDA published a report from A. Butorin, people's deputy of the RSFSR and member of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which had to do with the problems of the island's soviet. The editor's office received a letter from A. Vyuchenskiy, people's deputy of the USSR and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, with the request that the newspaper also publish his opinions on this subject.

First of all, about the question that A. Butorin is constantly stirring up in his appearances in the press, saying that Novaya Zemlya is not included in my electoral district. This is the undisputed truth, with a slight refinement. The election of people's deputies of the USSR took place a year before A. Butorin was elected people's deputy of the RSFSR. And therefore we, people's deputies of the USSR A. Yemelyanenkov (whose electoral district includes Novaya Zemlya), V. Gubin, G. Anisimova, A. Zolotkov, myself, and many others joined the movement "For a Nuclear-Free North" and to this day are active participants in it.

Butorin makes a very serious accusation against me and other deputies in the question: "Who tried to make Novaya Zemlya a center of social tension in the north and for what reason?" This is a political accusation and is very serious. My personal position and that of many of my deputy colleagues is the following: prohibition of nuclear tests anywhere in the world. And we, the USSR,

must make the first step in this connection. Nuclear tests in the Arctic, which the whole world considers to me the "weather kitchen of the Northern Hemisphere," must be prohibited.

In a law-governed state, the question of whether or not agencies of Soviet authority are needed on Novaya Zemlya, a territory of the USSR with an area of about 90,000 square kilometers, would not arise. To be sure, Comrade Butorin's concept of state authority (according to his article) is limited to the value of community services. For me, the institution of Soviet authority is a matter of state authority and for me a serviceman is a citizen of the USSR just as a civilian is. Consequently, at my request as a deputy, 66 million rubles were allocated for social and cultural services. I think that until nuclear tests are prohibited the testers must have a certain status that does not permit them to be discriminated against in any way, for they are carrying out state policy.

And a final question, that of compensation, in which Butorin accused me of pulling figures out of the air. Throughout the world, it is customary to pay before taking anything. But Butorin thinks that a serious conversation about compensation for proximity to a test range is possible only after an investigation, when it is determined where specifically, to whom by name, for what and in what amount the compensation is intended. In the United States, in the state of Nevada, the payment for risk alone without calculations amounts to \$1 billion, whereas in Semipalatinsk (where the military-industrial complex also asserted that there is no danger) the payment is 250 million rubles. And accordingly, it must also be 250 million rubles at the test range on Novaya Zemlya.

And in conclusion, I would like to say something about the natural resources of the islands, which Butorin unequivocally repudiates. Studies are needed here. Permanent residents have lived on the island since at least 1860 and they not only supported themselves but also traded with the mainland. The natives of Greenland live under analogous conditions. True, they live better than our citizens in the Crimea. Just as Butorin, I can refer to a number of specialists who assert the opposite of what his consultants say.

Taking this opportunity through your newspaper, I want to wish the very best to the testers on Novaya Zemlya.

#### CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

##### U.S. Article on CW Shipments From Germany Rebutted

PM1307133791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
13 Jul 91 Union Edition p 6

[By Colonel General G. Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff: "Just What Didn't the Spy Satellite See: Concerning a Publication in THE WASHINGTON TIMES"]

[Text] The beginning of perestroika in the USSR set off structural changes in Europe which introduced a new quality of relations between states. The Warsaw Pact military organization has disbanded itself, an event of such great importance to the whole of Europe. A whole series of international treaties has been signed (the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, and so forth) which have not only lowered the level of military confrontation but also envisaged unprecedented openness in the military sphere, which is expressed in extensive inspection activity and the creation of the institution of military observers.

In these conditions, when the need arose to objectively reassess the very principles of relations between states, certain circles in the West and the special services under their control have been faced with a dilemma: Either to change their work methods, honed over years and decades, in line with the new realities which have emerged in Europe, or to prove, come what may, that the old schemes and methods are correct. The second option is undoubtedly easier and more advantageous to them, since it enables them to confirm that they are needed. To that end, any means will do.

B. Gerts [name as transliterated], author of THE WASHINGTON TIMES article "U.S. Spy Satellites Refute Soviet Side's Statements on Chemical Weapons," acted in accordance with this altogether simple approach when he reported, citing U.S. satellite intelligence data that he claimed to have, on the detection of the Soviet Union's evacuation of its chemical weapons from the Western Group of Forces by sea transports. The most striking thing here is that the actual transportation of Soviet chemical munitions in disguised freight cars to the port of Rostock and their subsequent loading on ships is supposed to have been recorded by reconnaissance satellites. The absurdity of such claims is obvious. If it is possible by means of satellites to easily distinguish conventional from chemical munitions, if it is possible to detect chemical weapons stored at installations—and the article talks of the discovery of no less than nine Soviet chemical weapons dumps—the question is: Why does the Geneva multilateral convention on banning chemical weapons provide for the complex, costly, and labor-intensive procedures of international inspections to ensure observance of the convention's commitments?

Similar reports have appeared in the mass media before. Their main aim, in our opinion, is to hinder the development of positive processes in the international situation by means of deliberately false accusations against the USSR of covertly storing chemical weapons at installations of the Western Group of Forces. This despite the fact that back in 1987 the Soviet Union announced that it had no chemical weapons of its own outside its national borders.

Such reports, which produce the appropriate social and political response, are usually followed by requests for

international inspections at Soviet installations, ostensibly to remove the concern caused by the published materials. Such was the case last year and this year when the Soviet Union, as a goodwill gesture and to allay any suspicion about the storage of chemical munitions, allowed international experts to choose one Soviet facility in Germany and two in Poland to visit. The results of the inspection confirmed the absence of chemical weapons at the installations.

But if all this is to be repeated, then it is becoming clear that the matter has nothing to do with chemical weapons. The true purpose of such actions is to gather intelligence information on units and formations of the Western Group of Forces, to broaden and tighten the monitoring of the Soviet troop withdrawal, and to intensify the fuss surrounding an "environmental problem" where Soviet subunits are stationed.

In general it should be noted that publications like B. Gerts' article are precisely planned both in terms of their timing and their geography because they appear, as a rule, on the eve of important international meetings involving the top leaders of European states. However—and this, too, is a reality of our times—soberminded European politicians do not collate their actions with such "guardians" of international security as these.

#### **Claim of Soviet CW in Former GDR Said 'Gross Insinuation'**

*LD1007171491 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT  
10 Jul 91*

[By Igor Osinskiy: "No Soviet Chemical Weapons in Germany, Army Says"]

[Text] Berlin, July 10 (TASS)—A report alleging that Soviet chemical weapons [CW] are stationed on the territory of the former DDR [GDR] is a gross insinuation, according to officials in the Western Group of Forces.

According to reports in several German newspapers today, the Soviet Army, fearing imminent disclosure and trying to cover its tracks, is taking out chemical arms in disguised carriages at night in the direction of Rostock. From Rostock the weapons are shipped to the Soviet Union. The covert operation was alleged to have been photographed by U.S. satellites. The U.S. Department of Defence informed Bonn about this.

Commenting on whether such rumors are true, the BERLINER ZEITUNG newspaper believes that official denials by the German Defence Ministry should not be trusted.

The ministry once denied that there were Soviet nuclear weapons in the DDR. When Moscow admitted this, the ministry said it knew everything, but preferred to keep silent due to political reasons.

There are now chemical weapons in the Western Group of Forces and there are now depots with such weapons

on the territory of former DDR. [sentence as received]. [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1020 GMT on 10 July, in an identical report reads at this point: "The Western Group of Forces has no chemical weapons in its armory and no dumps for them on the territory of the former GDR."] A group of Bundeswehr experts could see it for themselves when they expected eight Soviet military facilities of their own choice and did not find any traces of chemical arms, according to a press release by the Western Group of Forces, circulated today.

The problem of the Soviet withdrawal from Germany has attracted increased interest by German news organisations recently. Frankly speaking, this interest is not always healthy. A week ago the BERLINER ZEITUNG and TAGESSPIEGEL frightened their readers with Soviet nuclear missiles that were allegedly left in a forest near Berlin. It turned out that the missiles long belonged to the Bundeswehr, were being prepared to be scrapped and carefully guarded.

BERLINER MORGENPOST reported today that two unidentified corpses had been found in a lake near Koenigs Wusterhausen. Without bothering to prove anything, the newspaper suggested that these are runaway KGB officers killed by their colleagues.

The dissemination of such unconfirmed information does not serve to promote trust and understanding that are so necessary for the peoples of our countries, who have jointly decided to reconsider the past and find a way to the final reconciliation, the Western Group of Forces said in its statement.

#### **CW Destruction Program Not Endorsed by Supreme Soviet**

*LD1007155591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 10 Jul 91*

[Excerpts] [Announcer Natalya Trifonova] About a year ago the U.S. and USSR presidents signed an accord on reducing the production of chemical weapons [CW] and destroying most of the stockpiles of such weapons in the United States and the USSR. In December 1990, by a decree of the USSR Council of Ministers, a decision was made to develop a program for destroying chemical weapons. Parliamentary hearings of the draft program were conducted by the Committee for the Issues of Ecology and Expedient Use of Natural Resources of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I am talking now to (Aleksey Yastrebov), representative of the above committee, a USSR people's deputy. [passage omitted] For the time being the program has not been adopted, correct?

[Yastrebov] Yes, unfortunately, the program has not been endorsed, draft legislative acts have not been submitted either to the Supreme Soviet or to the country's president. Besides, not a single one of the new working structures, neither a commission for selecting sites, not a committee or any other structure which could head, as

the executive body, the entire work for preparing and implementing the state program for eliminating chemical weapons has been set up. The implementation of this program will make it possible to solve issues which are topical for our country. [passage omitted]

## **ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES**

#### **Envoy Views Border Forces Reduction Talks With PRC**

*PM1607101391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 91 Union Edition p 6*

[Report by Yu. Savenko: "Border Talks Will Be Continued. USSR and China Reduce Troops"]

[Text] Beijing—As already reported, the fourth round of USSR-PRC talks on mutual armed forces reductions and confidence-building in the military sphere in the Sino-Soviet border region has ended in Beijing.

Until quite recently the Soviet-Chinese border (the longest in the world at over 7,500 km) was to all intents and purposes tightly closed. Much has changed in the last few years. The border regions' inhabitants are setting up joint ventures, visiting each other, and actively trading. The border settlement has progressed significantly. The legal formalization of agreed sections has begun, topographic work is under way, and maps are being prepared. The signing of the agreement on the eastern section of the Soviet-Chinese state border during the recent visit to Moscow of Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, is the most striking example of success in this issue. Incidentally, border procedures also became simpler after this.

Thanks to the favorable political atmosphere and the increasing development of Soviet-Chinese contacts in the military sphere, talks on mutual armed forces reductions and confidence-building in the military sphere in the border region have also become possible.

So how does G.V. Kireyev, leader of the Soviet delegation and USSR Foreign Ministry ambassador at large, evaluate the completed round of talks? At first, he said, I will remind you that in April 1990 in Moscow an intergovernmental agreement was signed on the guiding principles for mutual armed forces reductions and confidence-building in the military sphere in the Soviet-Chinese border region. (This agreement deals in particular with mutual security and the reduction of armed forces to the minimum level commensurate with normal good-neighborly relations; it also states that troops stationed in the border region can only fulfill defensive tasks and will not be capable of sudden attack etc.—Yu. S.). The agreement became the legal basis for further talks between the Soviet and Chinese delegations, and an objective discussion of the numerous problems identified by this document began. After three rounds of talks, a united opinion was arrived at—we should begin elaborating a general agreement.

The current discussions in Beijing have been about the focal problems of the future agreement, G. Kireyev continued. Views were exchanged on what branches of armed forces and what categories of weapons and military hardware will be cut. A lot of time was devoted to territorial problems. After all, it is necessary to define geographical zones for reductions and regions with special conditions in which military exercises should not be carried out nor military units stationed. Opinions were exchanged on monitoring the reduction process and on confidence-building measures. The discussion bore a conceptual character. The talks entered the stage of resolving the essence of questions, and they were conducted in a constructive and open atmosphere.

We will continue the discussion at the next round in Moscow, and maybe we will begin specifically agreeing articles. The issues are not easy, and haste is not our principle. The envoy believes that the most important thing is that Moscow and Beijing have set up for a highly important and complex military question a negotiating mechanism which has been working effectively for two years already.

#### **Envoy Deems Border Talks 'Definite Success'**

*OW1507092491 Moscow INTERFAX in English  
1200 GMT 12 Jul 91*

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] [no dateline as received] From June 13 through July 8, Beijing has been hosting the fourth round of talks between China and the USSR on the reduction of armed forces and the strengthening of mutual trust in the border region.

According to the head of the Soviet negotiating team, Genrikh Kireyev, the latest round of talks, the first official dialogue between Moscow and Beijing on the problems of the border region, have been a definite success.

In an interview for DP [Diplomatic Panorama], Kireyev said that the latest round had been used to work out the basis for a future agreement on the border territories. He said that the talks as a whole had offered much cause for optimism and that the drafting of the new agreement was the culmination of the progress and nearing of positions which had been achieved with every new round [sentence as received]. He said that he was particularly pleased with the new prospects for agreement on the size and composition of military forces in the region, territorial questions and new measures designed to increase mutual trust.

In the near future, Kireyev said, the two sides would be meeting once more to finalise the details of specific sections of the agreement. He was unwilling to set a deadline for the signing of the agreement: negotiations

were always, he said, extremely complex. The main thing was that neither side tried deliberately to delay proceedings.

The fifth round of talks are scheduled to take place in Moscow this autumn. According to tradition, of four annual rounds two are held in Moscow (in spring and autumn) and two in Beijing (in winter and summer).

#### **Further on Border Forces Reduction Talks With PRC**

##### **Fourth Round Held 13 Jun-8 Jul**

*LD0907151491 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT  
9 Jul 91*

[By correspondent Konstantin Toporkov]

[Text] Beijing, July 9 (TASS)—The fourth round of talks between the Soviet Union and China on mutual reductions of armed forces and confidence-building measures in border areas were held in Beijing from June 13 to July 8.

The sides discussed in detail the future agreement on the entire range of issues concerning reductions.

They discussed components and categories of [word indistinct] and hardware to be reduced, the agreement's territorial aspects and verification and confidence-building measures.

The talks, held in a traditionally constructive and businesslike atmosphere, helped deepen mutual understanding.

The Soviet delegation led by special envoy G.V. Kireyev was received by Colonel General Xu Xin, deputy chief of the Chinese General Staff, and Jiang Enzhou, assistant to the Chinese foreign minister.

At the invitation of the Chinese Defence Ministry the Soviet delegation toured the Shenyang Military District.

The sides agreed to hold the next round of talks in Moscow this autumn.

#### **'Key Provisions' Discussed**

*LD0907220891 Moscow TASS International Service  
in Russian 0430 GMT 9 Jul 91*

[By TASS correspondent Konstantin Toporkov]

[Text] Beijing, 9 July (TASS)—From 13 June to 8 July this year in Beijing, the fourth round of talks between the USSR and PRC on mutual reduction of armed forces and confidence-building in the military field on the Soviet-Chinese border was held.

The sides discussed in detail the key provisions of the future agreement on the set of questions and categories of the armaments and military equipment being reduced, on the territorial aspects of the agreement, and

on measures of verification and trust. The talks, which were held in the traditionally constructive and business-like atmosphere, deepened mutual understanding.

The USSR delegation, led by G.V. Kireyev, special envoy of the USSR Foreign Ministry, was received by Lieutenant General Xu Xin, deputy head of the General Staff of the Chinese PLA [People's Liberation Army]; and Jiang Enzhu, assistant to the PRC foreign minister.

At the invitation of the PRC Defense Ministry, the Soviet delegation made a fact-finding trip to Shenyang military district.

The sides agreed to hold the next round of talks in Moscow in the autumn of this year.

### Commentator Hails Results

*OW1107104791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin  
1400 GMT 10 Jul 91*

[Kondratyev commentary; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The Soviet Union and China held their fourth round of talks in Beijing on mutual reduction of military forces in the Soviet-Chinese border areas and on confidence-building in the military field. In the course of over two years of frequent and vigorous contacts in various aspects between the two countries, such talks seem very routine. Kondratyev, our station commentator, however, holds a different view: I believe that behind these seemingly ordinary talks positive, good, and tremendous changes in Soviet-Chinese relations and in the entire Asia-Pacific region are taking place. To prove this, I will mention some facts. Not long ago, both Moscow and Beijing seemed to be centers of all sorts of possible debates between the two countries. On the Soviet-Chinese border issue, however, words were turned into deeds, and the Soviet-Chinese border areas became dangerous zones of military confrontation between two powers with nuclear weapons. Therefore, the efforts of Moscow and Beijing in recent years to create an atmosphere of trust along the border were satisfactory. This issue was noted in the Soviet-Chinese communique, which was signed during Gorbachev's visit to China in 1989. A year later, the issues dealt with in the communique were supplemented by the Agreement on Mutual Reduction of Military Forces in the Soviet-Chinese Border Areas and Guiding Principles of Enhancing Trust in the Military Field.

The recent round of talks in Beijing indicates that this agreement is being implemented; that is, both sides are reducing the number of their troops stationed on the

border and moving them to their respective territories. The border line itself was also defined.

When Chinese leader Jiang Zeming visited Moscow in last May, both sides signed the Treaty on the Eastern Section of the Soviet-Chinese Border. Now, an atmosphere of friendship, peace, and cooperation prevails over the Soviet-Chinese border again. It should be noted that the USSR and the PRC are the first countries in Asia to take measures to ease the military situation in border areas. Conceivably, they have set a good example for other countries in the region.

### Third Stage of Troop Withdrawal From Mongolia Begins

*LD0907062791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1930 GMT 8 Jul 91*

[Text] Teriel Lordkipanidze, our correspondent in Mongolia, describes the start of the third stage of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country. He met a Mongolian deputy minister of defense.

[Lordkipanidze] The third stage of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Mongolian territory has started, said Major-General Luvsangiyin Purevdorj, deputy minister of defense of the Mongolian People's Republic. The protocol of the joint agreement envisages a precise timetable for the withdrawal. The combat troops will depart during the current year of 1991. In 1992 units ensuring the removal of material resources will depart. The Soviet troops have been serving in Mongolia at the request of our government, said Luvsangiyin Purevdorj. This was necessitated first and foremost by tension on the country's southern borders. Now, when a policy of detente and peace has become a reality and when an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding between neighboring countries is gaining in strength, the need for the presence of Soviet troops is decreasing. Trains carrying Soviet soldiers and their military equipment are heading for their homeland, said General Purevdorj, but cooperation between our armies will continue to develop and gain in strength.

The station of Choyr, from where I am making this report, is situated on the railway line between Ulaanbaatar and Beijing. Here the Soviet servicemen built themselves a townlet in the eastern Gobi Desert. Here in Choyr they performed their service. The time for farewells has arrived. The soldiers and the families of the soldiers are leaving. The townlet which is well equipped and comfortable will remain. Here are a few figures, as they say, for statistical purposes. Since the start of the withdrawal of Soviet troops, 11,692 two-and three-room apartments, 17 schools, 60 clubs, and 59 hospitals and clinics have been presented to the Mongolian people.

## REGIONAL AFFAIRS

## G-7 Statement on Monitoring of Arms Sales

LD1607140691 London PRESS ASSOCIATION  
in English 1307 GMT 16 Jul 91

[By political editor Chris Moncrieff]

[Excerpts] The world's economic leaders today reached an historic deal designed to monitor arms deals everywhere and to curb the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. It was the crowning achievement so far of the G7 summit in London of the seven richest economic nations, and wrangling over the small print went on far into the night and continued this morning.

John Major can claim considerable credit for reaching unity, because he insisted on a system of registration of all conventional arms deals throughout the world, monitored by the United Nations. This is to avoid the repetition of an Iraq-type situation where countries buy more arms than needed for legitimate defence requirements.

The publication of the arms deal document coincided with the issuing of the 16-paragraph political declaration, agreed last night by the leaders of the seven nations: the United States, Japan, Canada, France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. [passage omitted]

The arms document says: "We support the proposal for a universal register of arms transfers under the auspices of the United Nations and will work for its early adoption.

"Such a register would alert the international community to an attempt by a state to build up holdings of conventional weapons beyond a reasonable level."

Under the heading of "The Principle of Transparency in Arms Deals," the statement says information should be provided by all states on a regular basis after transfers have taken place. "We also urge greater openness about overall holdings of conventional weapons," say the summit leaders. The principle of consultation should now be strengthened through the rapid implementation of recent initiatives for discussions among leading arms exporters with the aim of agreeing a common approach to the guidelines which are applied in the transfer of conventional weapons, they continue.

"We welcome the recent opening of discussions on this subject. Each of us will continue to play a constructive part in this important process, in these and other appropriate fora." The document says the principle of action requires all nations to take steps to prevent the building-up of disproportionate arsenals. "To that end all countries should refrain from arms transfers which would be destabilising or would exacerbate existing tensions."

The summit nations say they are deeply concerned about the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical

weapons and missile delivery systems. "We are determined to combat this menace by strengthening and expanding the non-proliferation regimes."

The declaration pledges full G7 support for the UN special commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency in its attempts to ensure Iraq's capability for nuclear weapons is not developed. The aim of the summit nations is an effective, total ban on chemical and biological weapons, it adds. "Use of such weapons is an outrage against humanity."

"In the event that a state uses such weapons, each of us agrees to give immediate consideration to imposing severe measures against it both in the UN Security Council and elsewhere."

The G7 countries say they can make an important contribution to reducing the dangers of proliferation and conventional arms transfers.

"Our efforts and consultations on these issues, including with other supplier countries, will be continued in all appropriate fora so as to establish a new climate of global restraint."

"We will only succeed if others, including recipient countries, support us and if the international community unites in a new effort to remove these threats which can imperil the safety of all our peoples."

The arms document says that a special effort should be made to define sensitive items and production capacity for advanced weapons—which means the sale of spare parts will also come under UN scrutiny. The document also states: "We intend to give these issues our continuing close attention." It was this sentence which led to the disagreement. Britain was satisfied with it as it stood but some nations wanted it removed saying that the G7, an economic grouping, should not become so deeply involved in the arms question.

## FRANCE

## 'Sixth and Last' Mururoa Nuclear Test for 1991

LD1507223991 Paris France-Inter Radio Network  
in French 2200 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] France carried out an additional 50-kilotonne nuclear test on Mururoa today. It was the sixth and last test for this year.

## Official Sets Conditions for Ending Nuclear Tests

BK1207133591 Hong Kong AFP in English 0926 GMT  
12 Jul 91

[Text] Suva, July 12 (AFP)—France would stop nuclear testing in the Pacific if other powers followed its lead or it received proof of ecological damage, a French official said here Friday.

Jacques la Blanc, France's permanent secretary to the South Pacific, promised renewed efforts by Paris to bolster ties with Fiji and other South Pacific forum nations.

"There is a great need to study our policies in the region, especially in view of the many critiques we've had," he said.

Mr. la Blanc also defended France's decision to grant a knighthood to Rainbow Warrior bomber Alain Mafart, which has sparked anger especially in New Zealand.

"There is absolutely no connection between this award and the Rainbow Warrior. I accept that it was probably coincidental," he said.

Mr. la Blanc, who will lead a delegation to the South Pacific forum later this month, said the French colonies felt neglected in the Pacific.

"Since we're now considering giving our people more autonomy and leave it up to them to choose their own future, I think the best thing is to make them in contact with the region.

"We don't want our territories to be just part of France but also part of the Pacific."

He said the pro and anti-independence groups in New Caledonia would come to some understanding before a referendum in 1998 to decide whether the territory became independent.

"The situation would be very shaky if it was a 50-50 split," Mr. la Blanc said.

He denied France was using chequebook diplomacy to buy friends in the Pacific, saying increased aid was to meet demand.

"We've a new approach to the Pacific and we find that the governments are accepting us. With Fiji, our relations were very, very bad but now things are so much better."

Mr. la Blanc urged island governments and the South Pacific forum to abandon opposition to France's nuclear testing.

"So far no one has been able to prove that our testing is spoiling the environment," he said.

But Paris would halt its Pacific programme if "there is any danger from it. If everyone stops, no problem, so will we. But I don't see why France should be the only one to stop. It's a question of national defence for us."

#### Perm-5 Discuss Arms Sales Restrictions

*LD0807213991 Paris France-Inter Radio Network  
in French 1400 GMT 8 Jul 91*

[Text] Opening in Paris of the meeting of the Big Five on arms sales: The five permanent members of the UN Security Council [Perm-5], as well as the main producers

and exporters of weapons, are meeting at the moment to try to draw up ethics for the arms trade. China, the United States, the USSR, Great Britain, and France are represented by senior officials at this meeting, which is due to end tomorrow evening.

#### GERMANY

#### Reports of Soviet CW Still Being Removed Denied

##### Defense Ministry Denial

*LD0907131191 Hamburg DPA in German 1039 GMT  
9 Jul 91*

[Excerpt] Hamburg (DPA)—The Federal Defense Ministry today rejected press reports saying that the Soviet Union has transported chemical weapons [CW] from eastern Germany within the last few weeks. Defense Ministry Spokesman Karlheinz Reichert told DPA that the Federal Government had already been assured by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev that since 3 October 1990—the day of German unification—CW were no longer stored on the territory of the Federal Republic. "We have no grounds to doubt this statement." Additionally, there are no grounds to suggest that CW had been stored in the former GDR and had only just been removed. [passage omitted]

##### Soviet WGF Denial

*LD1007133491 Hamburg DPA in German 1238 GMT  
10 Jul 91*

[Excerpt] Berlin (DPA)—The Wuensdorf command center of the Western Group of Soviet Forces stationed in Germany [WGF] has said that the Western Group does not have any chemical weapons [CW]. There are also no stores of CW in the new laender, the Western Group's press center said in a statement issued today.

With this statement the Western Group is denying reports in THE WASHINGTON TIMES and STERN magazine that, according to the CIA, Moscow had stored "large amounts" of CW in eastern Germany, contrary to earlier declarations. [passage omitted]

#### Ministers Discuss Withdrawal of French Troops From Germany

*LD0907190491 Hamburg DPA in German 1241 GMT  
9 Jul 91*

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA)—France will withdraw its troops stationed in southwest Germany by 1993 or at the latest 1994, French Defense Minister Pierre Joxe told journalists in Bonn today. The withdrawal has already started. At the end of May 44,000 French soldiers were still in Germany. By the end of the year 20,000 Frenchmen are to be withdrawn. Together with his counterpart, Gerhard Stoltenberg (Christian Democratic Union), Joxe signed an agreement on cooperation of the German and the

French Air Forces in joint humanitarian aid operations, especially in Third World countries.

Joxe and Stoltenberg stressed that the role of the Western European Union (WEU) should be strengthened in the framework of a European security policy. However, Minister Joxe hinted that Paris was taking a somewhat different position on this. [passage omitted] Stoltenberg referred to his suggestion that within the WEU the question of European air transport capacity on a military level could be discussed. The minister reminded his audience that consequences would have to be drawn from the experiences of the Gulf war. The Europeans lacked high-capacity transport aircraft. There will be a center for the training of German and French helicopters and aircraft crews in France. Joxe also stressed that the transport problems for large-scale operations should be tackled jointly by the Europeans.

Both ministers praised the "excellent" relations between France and Germany, particularly in the military field. They referred to the German-French brigade—whose 4,200 soldiers are stationed in Boeblingen, Donaueschingen, Horb, Pforzheim, and Stetten am Kalten Markt. The ministers also stressed that the governments of the EC had to resolutely continue their efforts to achieve a peaceful solution of the conflict in Yugoslavia. France and Germany have developed a "very good cooperation," also concerning the armed forces, with Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

## TURKEY

### Greek Premier's Disarmament Proposal To Be Studied

TA1707110491 Ankara *Turkiye Radyolari Network* in Turkish 1000 GMT 17 Jul 1991

[Text] Turkey has announced that it will exert continuous efforts to develop cooperation and fruitful relations based on mutual respect, equality of rights, and security with all its neighbors, including Greece. Turkey further declared that if the proposal made by Greek Prime

Minister Konstandinos Mitsotakis on 12 July is to serve this goal, it must display a comprehensive and multidimensional approach.

In his weekly news conference today, Foreign Ministry spokesman Murat Sungar made a statement concerning Mitsotakis' proposal, which he claims is aimed at strengthening regional peace, security, and cooperation, and at eliminating the sources of tension.

Stressing that the importance Turkey attaches to regional peace and stability as well as to any dialogue aimed at achieving this goal is well known, Sungar noted that the Greek prime minister's proposal will be studied from all aspects. Sungar said that it is beneficial at this stage to bring certain matters to everyone's attention. He added: One of these matters is the fact that the Turkish and Greek units mentioned in the Greek proposal are deployed for purposes of common security and in accordance with plans drawn up by NATO—of which Greece too is a member—and, like the Bulgarian units, these units are subject to the rules of the recently concluded CFE agreement. Therefore, it is difficult to say that the Turkish, Greek, and Bulgarian units in the region would have a negative effect on the establishment of an atmosphere of trust among our countries.

Sungar remarked that one of the basic issues affecting the establishment and consolidation of an atmosphere of trust between Turkey and Greece consists of the failure to transform the Aegean into a sea of peace and cooperation between the two countries, despite all efforts on the part of Turkey. The spokesman pointed out that Greece's moves to militarize the eastern Aegean islands in violation of its international commitments is one of the major reasons for this state of affairs and constitutes an important issue with regard to efforts aimed at securing mutual trust in the region.

Sungar said that Greek (?compliance) with its international commitments in this field will make it easier to assess Mitsotakis' proposal within a more solid and comprehensive framework. Sungar added that this would render Greek initiatives more substantial and credible.